DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 377 CS 501 754

AUTHOR Emmert, Philip, Ed.; Miller, Keith A., Ed.
TITLE Communication and Growth Promoting Behavior.
INSTITUTION Wyoming Univ., Laramie.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 185p.
JOURNAL CIT Wyoming Publication; v40 Entire Issue 1976

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Skills; Conference Reports; *Individual Development; *Interaction; Interpersonal Competence; *Personal Growth; *Social Behavior

ABSTRACT

The papers collected in this volume were originally presented at a conference, funded by the University of Wyoming humanities program, designed to stimulate discussion of the issues surrounding the role of communication in establishing healthy human interaction. Section one contains the major position paper of the conference: John Stewart's "Where Are Our Roots? Crucial Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in the Dyadic Setting." John Keltner and Lyle L. Miller offer responses to Stewart's commentary. Section two includes discussion of critical questions in the application of growth-promoting communication in the group setting, by Bobby Patton, Raymond Tucker and Roger Wimmer, and William C. Donaghy. Crisis communication and growth-promoting behavior is discussed by William E. Arnold, William D. Brooks, and Hugh McGinley in section three. Section four offers analysis of the present state of research and research directions in the area, by Larry L. Barker and Loretta A. Malandro, Carl E. Larson, and Patrick J. McDermott. An overview of the implications of the topics discussed completes the volume. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140377

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMUNICATION

AND

GROWTH PROMOTING BEHAVIOR

Edited by
Philip Emmert
Keith A. Miller

University of Wyoming Graduate School

Wyoming Publications Volume XL 1976

CS 501754

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I 3

Where Are Our Roots? Crucial Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in the Dyadic Setting
John Stewart ..... 5 - 20

The Third Being in Dyadic Communication Existence, Encounter, and Knowledge of the Process of Being
John Keltner ..... 21 - 29

Examining the Roots: Response to John Stewart's Paper on Crucial Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in the Dyadic Setting
Lyle L. Miller ..... 31 - 42

SECTION II 43

Critical Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in The Group Setting
Bobby Patton ..... 45 - 55

Critical Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in the Group Setting: A Response
Raymond Tucker
Roger Wimmer ..... 57 - 64

Critical Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in the Group Setting: A Response
William C. Donaghy ..... 65 - 72

SECTION III 73

Crisis Communication and Growth-Promoting Behavior
William E. Arnold ..... 75 - 95

SECTION III continued

A Response to William E. Arnold's Paper, "Communication, Crisis, and Growth-Promoting Behavior."
William D. Brooks..... 97 - 102

The Need for Communication Research in Careline Services: A Little to do About Much
Hugh McGinley..... 103 - 109

SECTION IV..... 111

The Present State of Research and Research Directions of Growth-Promoting Communication Behavior
Larry L. Barker
Loretta A. Malandro..... 113 - 151

The Present State of Research and Research Directions of Growth Promotive Communication
Carl E. Larson..... 153 - 161

Present State of Research and Research Directions of Growth-Promoting Communication Behavior
Patrick J. McDermott..... 163 - 171

OVERVIEW

Communication and Growth-Promoting Behavior: An Overview and Suggestions
Keith Miller
Philip Emmert..... 173 - 182

ERRATA

1. Pg. 12 paragraph #2, line 4 "Encouter" - to - "Encounter"

2. Pg. 13 paragraph #3, line 2 "Disposses" - to - "dispossesses"

3. Pg. 14 paragraph #3, line 9 "lettering" - to - "letting"

4. Pg. 22 last paragraph, line 3 "spit" - to - "split"

5. Pg. 22 last paragraph, line 12 "not" - to - "nor"

6. Pg. 23 paragraph #3, line 2 "on page 9 of Stewart's paper" - to - "on page 11"

7. Pg. 23 paragraph #3, line 2 delete reference to footnote #4

8. Pg. 24 last paragraph, line 3 "curing" - to - "caring"

9. Pg. 25 paragraph #4, line 2 "like-giving" - to - "life-giving"

10. Pg. 45 bottom line - book title "Heel Me" - to - "Heal Me"

11. Pg. 47 last paragraph, line 9 "intergrated" - to - "integrated"

12. Pg. 49 paragraph 3, lines 4-9: Should read: "In this situation, when the "teacher" or "trainer" introduces exercises designed to open people up, to free them of inhibitions, to get them to express their pent-up feelings, I fear that we may be guilty of some of the charges of coercion."

13. Pg. 53 last paragraph, line 4 "chnages" - to - "changes"

14. Pg. 55 last paragraph, line 4 "Not all of all" - to - "not all of us"

15. Pg. 83 Figure two should be titled, "Psychological Phases of Crisis"

16. Pg. 97 paragraph 1, line 18 "untasted" - to - "untested"

17. Pg. 98 paragraph 1, line 9 "enabling" - to - "enobling"
paragraph 2, line 5 "page 13 of Arnold"- to - "page 82 of Arnold"
paragraph 6, line 4 should be "the difficulty of studying"
paragraph 6, line 8 "in sites" - to - "in situ"
paragraph 6, line 10 "(p.3)" - to - "(p. 77)"

18. Pg. 99 top paragraph, line 4 "as sell" - to - "as well"
bottom paragraph, line 11 "of persons when..." - to - "of persons whom"
bottom paragraph, line 17 "dessertion" - to - "desertion"

19. Pg. 100 bottom paragraph, line 5 "(p. 4)" - to - "(p. 76)"
bottom paragraph, line 13 "(p. 4)" - to - "(p. 76)"

bottom paragraph, line 13 "on page three" - to - "on page 76"
bottom paragraph, line 18 "on page four" - to - "on page 77"

20. Pg. 101 top paragraph, line 1 "(p.2)" - to - "(p.76)"
top paragraph, line 12 "(p. 10)" - to - "(p. 80)"
top paragraph, line 13 "lack or rest" - to - "lack of rest"
middle paragraph, line 4 "on page six" - to - "on page 78"

21. Pg. 102 top paragraph, line 2 "on page four" - to - "on page 77"
second paragraph, line 2 "on page six" - to - "on page 78"
third paragraph, line 4 "(Arnold, page 6)" - to - "(Arnold on page 80)"

22. Pg. 103 top paragraph, line 2 "applied, research" - to - "applied research"

23. Pg. 104 middle paragraph, line 27 "vaorably" - to - "favorably"

24. Pg. 104 footnote 2, line 2 "Simpilar" - to - "similar"

25. Pg. 155 bottom paragraph, line 8 "to eclectic" - to - "too eclectic"

26. Pg. 164 top paragraph, line 1 "On page seven" - to - "on page 116"

27. Pg. 169 top paragraph, line 3 "growth-promoting seesion" - to - "growth-promoting session"

28. Pg. 176 top paragraph, line 2 "It (growth) is something..." - to - "It (growth) is something which has occurred within an individual and which is "owned" by that person. This assumption is so strongly ingrained in our thinking that we may have become blind to another, perhaps equally as valid, assumption. "Growth" may, after all, be an interpersonal phenomenon and may be "owned" only by two persons in concert, but not individually."

29. Pg. 178 middle paragraph, line 12 "...individual uniqueness." - to - "individual uniqueness is, rather, a unique combination of 'person-systems', of one person with another and, further, with each other person with whom that person is in contact. Perhaps we overgeneralize and 'average over' all areas of 'between' for a given individual when counseling or teaching and dissect out of many of his or her systems the common behaviors only and call those his 'individual uniqueness'."

INTRODUCTION

The papers collected in this volume were prompted by a challenge offered to the authors to deal with the "crucial questions" of applying growth-promoting communication principles to human behavior. As the table of contents indicates, the papers were divided into four distinct areas of inquiry.

The purpose of this conference was to stimulate thought and discussion about the important issues surrounding the role of communication in establishing and maintaining healthy human interaction. The increasing concern among scholars and teachers about the significant role of communication behavior in promoting healthy human relationships has grown to the point that it is time to assess where we are and where we are going in defining, studying and implementing growth-promoting communicative behavior.

It is hoped this volume will provide a cornerstone for synthesizing existing concerns and information and to provide a basis for speculating about future concerns and research areas necessary to the continued growth of knowledge about healthy communication patterns among human beings.

As a final paper in the volume, the editors have written a paper which represents an attempt to synthesize the thinking of the other papers and suggest new directions for research. This paper was written while this volume was in preparation and is a response to not only the papers, but also the discussion of the papers during the conference. We offer it with the hope that it will stimulate further research and thinking in this area.

The conference at which these papers were originally presented was funded by the University of Wyoming Humanities Program.

CRUCIAL QUESTIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION IN THE DYADIC SETTING

Within interpersonal communication the basic structure is the dyad. For that reason, the papers in this section focus upon dyadic communication and its effect upon personal growth. The major position paper is by John Stewart, University of Washington. Responses to his paper are by John Keltner, Oregon State University and Lyle Miller, University of Wyoming.

WHERE ARE OUR ROOTS?

CRUCIAL QUESTIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION IN THE DYADIC SETTING

John Stewart

University of Washington

Introduction

This symposium's purpose, to explore "the role of communication behavior in promoting personal growth," is consistent with the historical purpose of a liberal, humanistic education, that is, to enable each person fully to develop his or her human potential. As Mark Van Doren describes it, humanistic liberal education calls for each person to become more than he is. ". . .there are degrees of humanity, the last one yielding not the least but the most recognizable man, the person most clearly and completely a specimen of his kind. The more one changes this way, the more one remains the same. The more, in other words, one becomes what one could be [p. 17]."

The philosophy of education articulated by Van Doren and others is, in turn, based on a view of the nature of humanity which assumes we are capable of growth. In other words, if we didn't assume people could grow, education wouldn't be worth the energy we invest in it. But we do; underlying our efforts to promote learning is the conviction that, as Charlotte Buhler puts it, "a human's basic tendency is toward a fulfillment, brought about by means of self-actualization or self-realization [p. 29]." And by self-actualization she means as Maslow puts it, "the tendency for [a person] to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming [Maslow, 1954, p. 92]."

I think that this same humanistic model should guide our study of human communication. In other words, as speech communication scholars engaged in speculation, research, and discussion about growth-promoting communication, we should strive to maximize our own potential as students and teachers. As we search for ways to understand and promote the kinds of human communication that facilitate personal growth, we should be actively working to become all we can become. That means that our efforts should be as holistic as possible, that is they should engage our whole persons--our contemplative, analytic, cognitive parts; our spontaneous, uninhibited, emotional parts; our active, instrumental, behavioral parts; and the ineffable elements of our human spirit.

In my judgment we have not yet done that. Speech communication scholars and teachers have not become holistically engaged in the study of growth-promoting or, as it is commonly called, interpersonal communication. Both our research and our teaching have focused from the beginning primarily on application.

The first major book in our field, Dean Barnlund's Interpersonal Communication: Survey and Studies (1968) includes some helpful efforts to outline a perspective or theoretical rationale; however, the work consists primarily of empirical studies of operationalized communication variables--interpersonal attraction, spatial ecology, communication channels in groups, facial and gestural expressions, etc. Barnlund's treatment-by-analysis-of-variables was followed two years later by John Keltner's text (1970) which focuses, as do virtually all introductory speech communication texts on the identification and improvement of communication skills--self-perception, giving feedback, listening, self-disclosure, discussion participation and leadership, persuasive speaking, etc. Since then the flood of basic texts has all but drowned us--there are presently twenty-seven on my shelf, and I know of several more that are on the way. Moreover, this same analytic, instrumental orientation is reflected in our journals. With few exceptions (Eg., Johannesen, 1971; Ilardo, 1972; Poulakos, 1974) articles related to growth-promoting communication deal with application--how to facilitate empathic listening, how to promote self-esteem, how Machiavellianism affects group processes, how rewards affect verbal responses, how to design and teach a basic interpersonal communication course, and so on.

I certainly do not think that this pragmatic, application-oriented focus is wholly inappropriate or mistaken. Historically one of the strengths of speech communication scholarship and teaching has been that we have remained consistently interested in what actually happens when people actually communicate. Much of my own writing and teaching energy goes into encouraging persons to develop their active, instrumental, behavioral parts and their spontaneous, uninhibited, emotional parts--and in working to develop my own.

The Question

But I also strongly believe that we will not realize our full potential as scholars and teachers until we develop more completely the aspects of our contemplative, cognitive selves through which we gain perspective on what we are trying to understand and until we acknowledge the impact of the ineffable elements of human spirit on our object of study. So long as we stay on our knees, squinting at human communicative transactions through analytic methodologies that only allow us to see what is clearly operationalized, we will not grow into all we can become. I think there is a serious need for speech communication scholars and teachers interested in "the role of communication behavior in promoting personal growth" to straighten up for a minute and look behind them. That's why I believe that the crucial question in the application of growth-promoting communication in the dyadic setting is "Where are our roots?" or, if you prefer a more pedantic formulation, "What presuppositions underlie the study of growth-promoting communication in dyads?" I'm convinced, in short, that our understanding will be incomplete until we supplement our practical teaching abilities and analytic, microscopic insights with knowledge of the foundations in philosophy and psychology of our study of interpersonal communication.

When we clearly recognize and understand our roots, I think the answers to several additional questions will also begin to emerge, questions like these:

What should be included in upper-division and graduate level study of growth-promoting communication?

Where does the development of "objectivity" fit into interpersonal communication research and teaching?

Isn't this stress on feeling and experiencing anti- or at least non-intellectual, and hence out of place in higher education?

Why do interpersonal communication scholars and teachers have so much trouble clearly describing important concepts like empathy, trust, transaction, and relationship?

Besides the facts that it's usually fun, a break from school routine, and often feels good, why should anyone study interpersonal communication?

Technically that could complete my presentation, since my assignment was simply to identify at least one "crucual question." But I'd prefer to go on, because I seldom get the opportunity to discuss the roots of our study. And I firmly believe that our understanding of them is crucially important.

In my judgment, the main roots of the study of interpersonal communication come from two philosophical traditions, existential phenomenology and philosophical anthropology. Both are as complex as their names suggest, and I certainly will not exhaustively treat either one here. But I would like to try to identify two or three elements of each approach that are particularly germane to our concerns, and then to suggest how some understanding of those approaches can help us answer a few of our most crucial questions.

Existential Phenomenology

Existentialism

Hundreds of philosophy and psychology books, novels, plays, and essays written in this century have described, explained, exemplified, or pursued the implications of existentialism. Although we have all heard the term used in a variety of contexts, however, there still seems to be considerable confusion about what it is. The confusion arises partly because there's no clear "it" to describe--existential thinkers are a diverse lot, and their emphases and means of expression often vary widely. Most seem to agree, however, that the human being should be seen as a free chooser, the source and center of all values; that, as one author (Greening, 1971) puts it, "God, Freud, and Marx cannot form us [p. 7]." Persons make themselves. As Rollo May (1960) points out, "existentialism involves centering upon the existing person and emphasizes the human being as he is _emerging_, _becoming_ [p. 11]." That makes their view consonant with and in fact part of the foundation of the growth model I mentioned earlier.

Another widely-accepted defining principle of existentialism is stated in Sartre's famous phrase, "existence precedes essence." In that slogan Sartre not

only reemphasizes existentialism's focus on the human as chooser but also stresses its distrust of immutable principles and logical laws that are believed to stand above and beyond any given existing being. As Paul Tillich explains, the meaning of Sartre's phrase "is that [a human] is a being of whom no essence can be affirmed, for such an essence would introduce a permanent element, contradictory to [the human's] power of transforming himself indefinitely [In Greening, 1960, p. 13]." Our particular nature as humans is our power to create ourselves. The only "essential" truth or reality that any human being can have is the one in which he or she participates, is conscious of, and creates through and in his or her living-in-the-world.

Human-centeredness and the primacy of existence over essence are certainly not all there is to existentialism. But much of the remainder of this view is at least as much phenomenological as it is existential, and since several insights that are crucially important to our study of growth-promoting communication grow most directly out of phenomenology, I would like to turn now, in a little more detail, to that view.

Phenomenology

Like existentialism, phenomenology is a difficult term to define; an unusually wide variety of modern intellectual programs are identified by that title. A list of phenomenologically-oriented philosophers, for example, would have to include the father of modern philosophy, Immanuel Kant; Franz Brentano, G.W.F. Hegel, and many of the twentieth century's most influential thinkers such as Sartre, Husserl, Heidegger, Marcel, and Merleau-Ponty. A phenomenological school of psychiatry, currently flourishing in Europe and the United States, was established by Ludwig Binswanger, Karl Jaspers, and others (Tymieniecka, 1962, p. 66). Jean Piaget's studies reflect the impact of phenomenology on child psychology (Tymieniecka, 1962, pp. 38-40, 49); George A. Kelly characterizes his approach to the psychology of personality as phenomenological (Kelly, 1963, pp. xi, 17). Martin Buber's philosophical anthropology is in part phenomenological (Friedman, 1965, pp. 161-175) and Rene Wellek and Austin Warren have been called phenomenological literary critics (Tymieniecka, 1962, pp. 33, 57).

Phenomenology is also difficult to understand because of what seems to be the perverse obscurity of some of its proponents' means of expression. The jargon is sometimes incomprehensible, especially to a mind nurtured on the cause-effect relationships of an Aristotelian-Cartesian epistemology. Coping with unfamiliar locutions like "being-in-the-world," "pre-reflective cogito," and "eidetic reduction" is not enough; the serious reader will also have to translate such statements as, "Subjectivity forever nihilates facticity on the affective level in the course of its involvement with reality [Luijpen, 1966, p. 111]."

Some of the latter difficulties result from having to translate from the original French and German works replete with coinages and technical terms.

But the uninitiated reader's frustration cannot so easily be explained away. Phenomenologists argue that their apparent disdain for clear prose is actually an attempt to express insights revealed by a perspective or mode of thinking significantly different from pre-phenomenological western thought. And that is one important reason why this perspective can offer us so much. Phenomenology often seems unclear because its writers are charting previously unexplored intellectual ground. Husserl, for example, sometimes compared himself to an explorer who had come upon an entirely new and vast land (Zaner, 1970, p. 33). Merleau-Ponty's writing is similarly difficult; in fact, one interpreter (Kwant, 1963) argues that it would be impossible to render a clear description of Merleau-Ponty's concept of the "I body" or "body subject."

> In principle such a description is not possible because that which is to be described is obscure. . . . This is a concrete indication that our concepts of "mechanical bodiness" and of "spirit" are abstract and one-sided forms of thinking, which are unsuitable for expressing reality in a genuine way. The Cartesian categories may seem to be clear and distinct, but their clarity is a blinding light preventing us from seeing reality in its genuine condition . . . . One who would attempt to present a systematic survey of Merleau Ponty's ideas regarding the body-subject would merely succeed in making it obvious that he does not understand his philosophy [pp. 29, 34].

In other words, the first insight phenomenology offers us is that, if you are confused, you're beginning to understand the situation. Phenomenology often seems maddeningly unclear, but that is frequently due to the difficulties of explaining living events accurately. Often the hyphenated terms and curious -ing endings reflect the phenomenologist's attempt to escape limitations that Aristotelian-Cartesian thought and language have imposed on us, and to explain reality in terms that more closely approximate what we now understand to be its ever-changing, process-like nature.

Reality as Relational. Another central insight, and one immediately relevant to our concerns, grows out of this commitment to accurate description of "the way things actually are." That is the recognition that reality is relational. In fact, the phenomenological perspective begins from this unique view of the fundamental nature of reality. Plato was convinced that he could elucidate reality by describing the world of Forms or Ideas. Aristotle, on the other hand, believed more in the careful, minute, unbiased analysis of "the real world"; for him the existence of objects of knowledge was not dependent on their being known by some subject. It would only be a slight overgeneralization to say that, up to the development of the phenomenological perspective, the history of western philosophy has been a series of variations on these two themes, generally referred to as idealism and realism.

Phenomenology breaks with that traditional pattern, but the radical difference it introduces is not immediately apparent. The aim of phenomenology, like that of programs from idealism to logical positivism, is to provide philosophy with an apodictic foundation, an absolute starting point. And that starting

point does not at first glance seem to be radically new. In fact, phenomenology's most influential progenitor, Edmund Husserl, began where Descartes did. Both Descartes and Husserl argued that philosophy must start from an understanding of the ego cogito, the conscious subject or "thinking person."

In an important sense, however, the similarity ends there. As Joseph Kockelmans (1967) explains, for Husserl

> every cogito [act of consciousness] is essentially the cogito of a cogitatum [object of consciousness]. Against Descartes, therefore, Husserl maintains that not only the fact of the cogito is an absolute and indubitable datum but that the cogitatum is also such a datum, provided this cogitatum is taken as it immediately appears in the cogito. [p. 108].

In other words, for Husserl the primary reality is consciousness, but all consciousness is intentional or oriented toward some object; all consciousness is consciousness-of-something. Thus for the phenomenological descendants of Husserl reality exists neither in subjects or persons (as it does for idealism) nor in objects (as for realism) but in phenomena, the meeting of subject and object in consciousness. The phenomenologist is primarily interested in the irreducible relationship or active encounter between subject and object. He or she does not believe that reality exists simply in the mind of the perceiver or simply in wordly objects which minds must work to know. Instead, the fundamental datum of reality is the active meeting between a conscious subject and some aspect of the world. The principal purpose of phenomenological thought

> has been to express how impossible it is to think about a subject without thinking of his world, or to think of the world without reference to the subject. The term encounter probably best fulfills that purpose. Encounter is unthinkable as long as we insist on separating the two terms of the meeting. An encounter is not an encounter if a subject does not meet with "something." If the subject does not meet something, then, he does not meet at all; the "something" or "somebody" is necessary if we are to speak of meeting or encounter at all. Nor could the "something" or "somebody" function as a term of the encounter or meeting without the encountering subject. Both terms of an encounter are inseparably linked together [Luijpen, 1966, p. 87. Italics added].

The phenomenology that Husserl founded is thus:

> neither a science of objects nor a science of the subject . . . . It does not concentrate exclusively on either the objects of experience or on the subject of experience, but on the point of contact where being and consciousness meet . . . . The subject (noesis) and the object (noema) are studied in their strict correlativity on each level of experience (perception, imagination, categorical thought, etc.). . . [Edie, 1962, p. 20].

In short, for Husserl and for his intellectual descendants, reality is a dialogue between perceiver and perceived. To remove one of the partners means to remove the whole of the dialogue. Neither of the participants can be considered in isolation from the other. As one author (Luijpen, 1966) puts it, "Here we find the primal source in which all further philosophical judgments find their origin. The dialogue cannot be reduced to simpler elements. The reductive step that tries to go beyond dialogue [relationship, encounter] leads to nothing [p. 88]." (See also Zaner, 1970, p. 81 and Thévenaz, 1962, pp. 47, 48, 84, 86, 90.)

Perhaps the most important outcome of the phenomenologist's relational view of reality and the one most familiar to speech communication scholars and teachers, is the rejection of "objectivity" as a criterion for valid and reliable knowledge. For the phenomenologist knowledge is not a matter of correspondence between our sensations and an external world separated from human consciousness. On the contrary, without human consciousness there is no "world;" the notion of "world" itself implies a consciousness to perceive it; to be implies to-be-for-a-person. Thus, just as consciousness is always consciousness-of, world is always world-for. The "known world" is a world-known-by-consciousness. To put it another way, if subject and object are irreducibly bound through the inherent intentionality of consciousness, the world for that conscious subject does not consist solely of "soaked up sense data." Our world is a world of meanings constituted by us. As Husserl (in Kockelmans, 1967) puts it, each act of consciousness entails a corresponding object; "moreover the character of this object is co-determined by the character of the act in which the object appears [pp. 32-332]." In Pierre Thévenaz' (1962) words, phenomenology investigates neither "external" nor "internal" "facts." Instead, it

> leaves the question of objective reality or of real content aside in order to turn its attention solely and simply on the reality in consciousness, on the objects insofar as they are intended by and in consciousness, in short on what Husserl calls ideal essences. By this we must not understand mere subjective representations (which would leave us on the plane of psychology) nor ideal realities (which would "reify" or hypostatize unduly the data of consciousness and would put us on the level of metaphysics), but precisely the "phenomena" [p. 43].

The second insight of phenomenology, then, is that reality and human knowledge are relational, that the most basic things we can perceive and know are phenomena, situated, active meetings between consciousness and some aspect of its world.

Knowledge in Intuition. For the phenomenologist, not only is knowledge relational, it is also, in a special sense, intuitive. The phenomenon, as Thévenaz (1962) explains, "is that which manifests itself immediately in consciousness; it is grasped in an intuition that precedes any reflexion or any judgment [p. 43]." In other words, the primal act of knowing is pre-reflective, pre-analytic. The special character of the phenomenologist's intuition, however,

is as important as its primacy. Phenomenologists emphatically do not assert that knowledge is based fundamentally on unreasonable, unexplicable hunches. Like Descartes (1955) the phenomenologist views intuition not as 'the fluctuating testimony of the senses, not the misleading judgment that proceeds from the blundering constructions of imagination, but the conception which an unclouded and attentive mind gives us so readily and distinctly that we are wholly freed from doubt about that which we understand. . . [p. 7]." The phenomenologist's intuition, far from being a nebulous, arbitrary hunch, is strictly the product of a rigorous process of methodical doubt. For some critics--and adherents--the difficult point to grasp is that this primal act of knowing can be rigorous and yet non-analytic. But it is.

In sum, the search in phenomenology for an apodictic foundation for philosophy leads first to consciousness, which can only be understood as consciousness-of-something. The second step is to identify the primal event in which this intentional consciousness participates; it is the encouter between noesis (subject) and noema (object). This event is non-rational, non-analytic; it is unreflective, or more accurately, pre-reflective. In that sense it is intuitive. Phenomenology, in other words, seeks

> "to penetrate to the indisputable roots of our thinking. As such it presupposes a return to our 'lived world,' to the world of our original experience. . . . The realm of the unreflective (l'irreflechi) is itself the fertile soil from which philosophy springs. A philosophical judgment is the explication of the pre-reflective cogito. The pre-reflective cogito, therefore, is the source from which all truth wells up [Liujpen, 1966, p. 607]."

According to Kockelmans (1967), Husserl puts it this way: "Every originarily giving intuition is a legitimate source of knowledge. . . . Everything which presents itself to us originarily in 'intuition,' so to speak in its bodily presence, has to be taken simply as what it presents itself to be, but only within the limits in which it presents itself [p. 30]."

As I've already mentioned, Husserl and others go to great pains to describe the special character of this intuition and to suggest how one can be led to experience it. But the point I'd like to make is simply that intuition is basic, that phenomenology identifies the fundamental act of knowing as an immediate, experiential, pre-reflective meeting.

Philosophical Anthropology

Philosophical anthropology, like cultural or social anthropology, is a study of the development of humanity, but, as Michael Landmann (1974) explains, unlike those disciplines which "both presuppose knowledge about the nature of man and examine merely his external characteristics or cultural achievements," philosophical anthropology "investigates precisely the knowledge that these sciences take for granted and inquires into the fundamental ontological structures that constitute man in contrast to all other beings that exist [p. 18]." (See also Pappé, 1967, pp. 159-166.

Contemporary philosophical anthropology originated about 1920 and grew out of the work of Marx, Neitzsche, Kierkegaard, Feuerbach, and especially, Kant. Proponents include Max Scheler, Ernst Cassirer, Pierre Tielhard de Chardin, Erich Fromm, Ludwig Binswanger, and Martin Buber. The authors of a textbook in philosophical anthropology published in 1969 (Byrne and Maziarz) write that their purpose is "to stimulate the kind of thinking which will lead to an intelligent correlation between divergent but nonetheless complementary approaches to the study of man [p. ix]."

Immanuel Kant laid the foundation of philosophical anthropology when he identified the four questions that demarcate the field of philosophy: (1) What can I know? (2) What ought I to do? (3) What may I hope? (4) What is man? According to Kant (1885) metaphysics answers the first question, ethics the second, religion the third, and philosophical anthropology the fourth. Furthermore, Kant added, "all these might be reckoned under anthropology, since the first three questions refer to the last [p. 15]." Kant concluded, in other words, that the three questions which ground most of what is known in philosophy can be traced back to a prior question about the nature of man. That question is the starting point for philosophical anthropology which then becomes the fundamental philosophical science. Paradoxically, Kant did not focus his philosophical energy on answering the fourth question he asked.

After Kant, according to Martin Buber's account (Buber, 1965) Hegel's contribution to philosophical anthropology was to dispossess "the concrete human person and the concrete human community in favor of universal reason, its dialectical processes and its objective structures [p. 137]." In Marx the Hegelian concept of universal reason is "replaced by human conditions of production, from whose transformation proceeds the transformation of society [Buber, p. 143]." Neitzsche brought actual man into the center of his thought; the problematic, questionableness of the human is a theme which engaged him throughout his career as a philosopher. But he never recognized the impact of an insight from one of his philosophical forebearers, Ludwig Feuerbach (1966).

Feuerbach's insight and Buber's development of it are, I think, two of the central understandings which the study of growth promoting communication can gain from philosophical anthropology. Feuerbach saw that Kant established cognition as the ground of philosophy, and thus made epistemology or the study of knowledge the most important branch of philosophy. Unlike Kant, however, Feuerbach made the whole human being, not just human cognition, the beginning of philosophizing. According to Feuerbach, "the new philosophy makes man. . . . the unique universal and highest object of philosophy. It thus makes anthropology . . . the universal science [p. 70]." Besides holism, Feuerbach added one other dimension to the study of man, a dimension that is decisive for our interest in growth-promoting communication.

Humanness is Interpersonal

This human whom Feuerbach views as the highest subject of philosophy is not individual but interpersonal. "The single man for himself," Feuerbach

writes, "possesses the essence of man neither as a moral being nor in himself as a thinking being. The essence of man is contained only in the community, and unity of man with man; it is a unity, however, which rests only on the reality of the distinction between I and thou [p. 71]." Although he did not pursue that insight, Feuerbach introduced what has been called "the Copernican revolution in modern thought, [Heim, 1930, p. 333]," the concept of the ontologically interpersonal nature of the human being, the notion that human personhood is an interpersonal phenomenon.

Kierkegaard, Husserl, Heidegger, and Scheler all added to the development of philosophical anthropology. But none pursued with seriousness Feuerbach's most important insight. None developed an holistic view of the human person that recognized consistently our fundamentally interpersonal nature. That is Martin Buber's contribution.[1]

Buber (1965) insists that the answer to Kant's question, What is man? can never be found so long as we look only at the human individual as such; we must consider persons-in-relation. But the relationships to which he directs us are emphatically not those of the "mass" or of "society." Just as it is misleading to view the human strictly as an individual, condemned, as Sartre argues, to radical separation and existential loneliness, so it is incorrect to see the person as totally embedded in a massive social, political, or religious group. One can avoid feelings of existential isolation by burying his or her needs in those of the "general will" and by lettering his or her responsibility for living become absorbed in a completely collective responsibility. But that approach, Buber argues, is ultimately as fruitless as a life of radical solitude.

He summarizes his position in these words:

> The fundamental fact of human existence is neither the individual as such nor the aggregate as such. Each, considered by itself, is a mighty abstraction. The individual is a fact of existence in so far as he steps into a living relation with other individuals. The aggregate is a fact of existence in so far as it is built up of living units of relation. The fundamental fact of human existence is man with man. What is peculiarly characteristic of the human world is above all that something takes place between one being and another the like of which can be found nowhere in nature. Language is only a sign and a means for it, all achievement of the spirit has been incited by it. Man is made man by it. . . . It is rooted in one being, turning to another as another, as this particular other being, in order to communicate . . . in a sphere which is common to them but which reaches out beyond the special sphere of each. I call this sphere, which is established with the existence of man as man but which is conceptually still uncomprehended, the sphere of "between." Though being realized in very different degrees, it is a primal category of human reality. [pp. 202-203].

---

[1] Interestingly, a similar viewpoint has been reached, apparently independently, by the contemporary Scottish philosopher, John MacMurray, whose work has been centrally important to R.D. Laing. See MacMurray's The Self as Agent. London: Faber & Faber, 1957. and his Persons in Relation. London: Faber & Faber, 1961.

To clarify the distinction he is making, Buber (1965) uses two analogies:

> If you consider the individual by himself, then you see of man just as much as you see of the moon; only man with man provides a full image. If you consider the aggregate by itself, then you see of man just as much as we see of the Milky Way; only man with man is a completely outlined form. Consider man with man, and you see human life, dynamic, two-fold, the giver and the receiver, he who does and he who endures, the attacking force and the defending force, the nature which investigates and the nature which supplies information, the request begged and granted--and always both together, completing one another in mutual contribution, together showing forth man. Now you can turn to the individual and you recognize him as man according to the possibility of relation which he shows; you can turn to the aggregate and you recognize it as man according to the fullness of relation which he shows. We may come nearer the answer to the question what man is when we come to see him as the eternal meeting of the One with the Other [p. 205].

In Buber's view, humanness is an ontologically interpersonal phenomenon. The human person can be understood neither as a monad in an alien world nor as simply a part of a collective whole. The humanness of the human person "cannot be grasped on the basis of the one of personal existence, or of that of two personal existences, but of that which has its being between them and transcends both. . . . That essence of man which is special to him can be directly known only in a living relation [pp. 204-205]."

Interestingly that brings us right back where we started--in a couple of ways. You might feel confused or even put off a little as you hear Buber talking about the "between" and about the dynamically twofold, almost yin-yang human relation--"giver and receiver . . . he who does and he who endures . . . the request begged and granted. . . ." It might sound hopelessly vague and too poetically abstract to be accurate or even useful. Buber admits that the nature of the between, the living relation, is "conceptually still uncomprehended." But like the other phenomenologists discussed earlier, he believes that this way of describing his subject is inescapable, so long as he continues to point to realities which have not been clearly seen before.[2]

More importantly, Buber brings the phenomenological concept of relational reality to human ontology. He recognizes clearly and with certainty that if we want to comprehend the whole human person, we must look at persons-in-relation.

---

[2]A dissertation in progress in the University of Washington Speech Department explains in some detail the methodological problem of dealing in a scholarly way with Buber's work. See Clark, A. Dialogue and the relations among speaking, poetry, and human existence in Martin Buber's philosophical anthropology, unpublished paper, 1974, pp. 5-31.

When he speaks of this relation, "Buber means the working out or 'happening,' between independent beings in an actual situation, of the reciprocal address and response which determines the mode of existence of each for the other. Authentic existence as a genuine human being is, in Buber's philosophical anthropology, mutual existence [Clark, 1974, p. 4]." In the words quoted before, "the dialogue cannot be reduced to simpler elements. The reductive step that tries to go beyond relationship or encounter leads to nothing."

Back to the Questions

1. Where are our roots?

I think the deepest roots of the study of growth-promoting communication in dyads are in existential phenomenology and philosophical anthropology. More specifically, I believe the insights most fundamental to our study are (a) the existential emphasis on the human right and responsibility to choose, to make his or her own way, (b) the phenomenological recognition of the primacy of relation, (c) of the fundamentally intuitive nature of the act of knowing, and (d) the identification in Buber's philosophical anthropology of the ontologically interpersonal nature of the human person.

2. What should be included in upper division and graduate level study of growth-promoting communication?

I include this question because I see our field having started to study growth-promoting communication at the basic course level, and now being in the happy position of having a number of students who want more. But I don't sense much agreement about where they might profitably go beyond the basic course. There are a number of useful bodies of literature, for example in social psychology, humanistic psychology, psychiatry, and the psychology of interpersonality.[3]

But I believe the authors I have been discussing also warrant our attention. Basic texts can be grounded in the views I have sketched, but most of the works I have talked about can be more appropriately worked through at the junior, senior, and graduate levels. Incidentally, Buber's writing has been well-received in a junior-level interpersonal communication course in our department, and graduate students responded positively to a seminar in philosophical anthropology.

3. Where does the development of objectivity fit in interpersonal communication research and teaching?

Hopefully by now the drive for stereotyped "scientific" knowledge is dead. We recognize the impossibility of a human designing and carrying out truly objective, completely controlled, exhaustively operationalized research that accurately pinpoints genuinely causal relationships. That certainly does not mean that the need for careful planning and rigorous analysis is dead. Well-

---

[3]A particularly good introductory survey which discusses H.S. Sullivan, Don D. Jackson, R.D. Laing, Eric Berne, A.H. Maslow, Erving Goffman, and several others is C.H. Swensen, Jr., Introduction to Interpersonal Relations. Glenview, Ill.: Scott-Foresman, 1973.

conceived, well-executed, and effectively-reported research is still desperately needed. But our research problems, designs, statistical treatments and reports need to acknowledge specifically and clearly, as Dewey and Bentley (1949) pointed out twenty-five years ago, that all acknowledge is a function of the relationship between a subjective knower and the known.

4. Isn't this stress on feeling and experiencing anti- or at least non-intellectual, and hence out of place in higher education?

When writing and teaching urge experience simply because "it feels good," critics have a right to complain.[4] But when the stress on experiential learning is grounded in a clear realization of the fundamentally intuitive nature of the human act of knowing, the process becomes completely justifiable and eminently appropriate. In fact, it constitutes the application of education of some of our best philosophical and psychological knowledge of the human person.

5. Why do interpersonal communication scholars and teachers have so much trouble clearly describing important concepts like empathy, trust, transaction, and relationship?

Most of my response to this question comes from the reactions to the previous two. We have been bewitched by our drive to objectify and operationalize events and qualities which resist that kind of treatment. Often we have tried to understand living relations by reducing them to their "constituent parts" and have, in the process, killed them. We have been unwilling to accept the ineffable nature of some human experiencing. I do not mean we should throw up our hands and capitulate to the mystics or the psychological alchemists. But we should recognize that some important human events do not fit into and cannot be produced by the most currently popular way of knowing, the scientific method, and that they also often cannot be described in the linear structure and causal logic of Standard American English.

6. Besides the fact that it's usually fun, a break from school routine, and often feels good, why should anyone study interpersonal communication?

For me this is the real key. If it is true that humanness is an interpersonal phenomenon and that I am constantly becoming human, then my relationships with others are not just one of the many sets of things I do from day to day. If I am actually becoming human interpersonally, then the quality of my interpersonal relationships is directly affecting the quality of my emerging personhood. Human growth happens in interpersonal relationships. As a result, the quality of those relationships is centrally important to me. My interpersonal communicating is just about the most important thing I do.

Notice that this argument-for-our-own-importance is not based just on political assumptions--democracy is good and speech promotes democracy--; psychological assumptions--people feel better about themselves when they can communicate effectively with others--; or social assumptions--well-adjusted

---

[4]On the other hand, it might be perfectly appropriate for faculty-led programs in higher education to be dedicated in part to simple, uncomplicated fun. . . .

persons create a smoothly-running society--important as those assumptions are. The study of growth-promoting communication is directly grounded in ontological insights about the nature of the human person, insights recognized in varying degrees by an international group of several generations of philosophers and other scholars.

Properly understood, then, research and teaching in growth-promoting or interpersonal communication represent much more than an academic fad. On the one hand, irresponsible practitioners have justified all sorts of mindless, inappropriately intimate "group gropes" by claiming that they contribute to interpersonal growth, and those persons' efforts will doubtless continue. On the other hand, critics have often assumed that all experiential learning is by definition anti-intellectual and that research cannot be holistic or subjective and still be rigorous. Those complaints will also certainly be repeated. The serious study of interpersonal communication, however, is grounded in a rich scholarly tradition and in the crucially important insight that humanness is fully realized only in the meeting of person with person. Since that meeting proceeds by way of and is always mediated by communication, the investigation of that phenomenon--of interpersonal communication--is clearly a central human study.

References

Barnlund, D. Interpersonal Communication: Survey and Studies. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Buber, M. Between Man and Man. Trans. R.G. Smith. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Buhler, C. Existential and Humanistic Psychology: Responses to Contemporary Challenges, in T.C. Greening (Ed.), Existential Humanistic Psychology. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1971.

Byrne, E.G. & Maziarz, E.A. Human Being and Being Human: Man's Philosophies of Man. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1969.

Descartes, R. Rules: Philosophical Works of Descartes. Trans. E.S. Haldane and G.R.T. Ross. New York: Dover, 1931-1934.

Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. Knowing and the Known. Boston: Beacon, 1949.

Edie, J.M. Introduction, in Thévenaz, P. What is Phenomenology? And Other Essays. Trans. J.M. Edie, C. Courtney & P. Brockelman. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1962.

Friedman, M.F. Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue. New York: Harper, 1960.

Feuerbach, L. Principles of the Philosophy of the Future. Trans. M.H. Vogel. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Greening, T.C. (Ed.) Existential Humanistic Psychology. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1971.

Heim, K. Ontologie und Theologie. Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, neue Folge XI, 1930. Cited by Buber, 1965, p. 148.

Ilardo, J.A. Why Interpersonal Communication? Speech Teacher, 1972, 11, 1-6.

Johannesen, R.L. The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1971, 57, 373-382.

Kant, I. Kant's Introduction to Logic and His Essay on the Mistaken Subtilty of the Four Figures. Trans. T.K. Abbott. London: Longman's Green, 1885.

Kelly, G.A. A Theory of Personality: The Psychology of Personal Constructs. New York: Norton, 1963.

Keltner, J. Interpersonal Speech-Communication: Elements and Structures. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1970.

Kockelmans, J.J. (Ed.) Phenomenology: The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and Its Interpretation. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1967.

Kwant, R.C. The Phenomenological Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty. Pittsburgh: Duquesne U. Press, 1963.

Landmann, M. Philosophical Anthropology. Trans. D.J. Parent. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1974.

Luijpen, W.A. Phenomenology and Humanism: A Primer in Existential Phenomenology. Pittsburgh, Duquesne U. Press, 1966.

Maslow, A. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

May, R. (Ed.) Existential Psychology. (2nd ed.) New York: Random House, 1960.

Pappe, H.O. Philosophical Anthropology. In The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Ed. P. Edwards. Vol. 6. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Poulakos, J. The Components of Dialogue. Western Speech, 1974, 38, 199-212.

Thévenaz, P. What is Phenomenology? And Other Essays. Trans. J.M. Edie, C. Courtney, & P. Brockelman. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1962.

Tymieniecka, A.T. Phenomenology and Science in Contemporary European Thought. New York: Noonday Press, 1962.

Van Doren, M. The Educated Person. Liberal Education. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

Zaner, R.M. The Way of Phenomenology: Criticism as a Philosophical Discipline. New York: Pegasus, 1970.

THE THIRD BEING IN DYADIC COMMUNICATION

EXISTENCE, ENCOUNTER, ESSENCE, AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROCESS OF BEING.

John W. Keltner

Oregon State University

(A Commentary stimulated by the paper of John Stewart entitled "Where are Our Roots? Crucial Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in the Dyadic Setting")

John Stewart's paper led me to return to some work of Warren S. McCulloch who, in a brilliant and penetrating commentary on the work of Eihard Von Domarus, said that

> ...The relations we are interested in are inherently triadic ...and we need to create a logic which will handle triadic relations. ("A believes B is C; A knows that B is C; A sold B to C; A gave B to C.")[1]

Referring to the work of Charles Saunders Pierce, McCulloch describes the condition in the following manner:

> ...The relation of intention is crucial...There does not exist a logic that handles intentional relations properly. There is no calculus for it...
>
> There is a noble gas--helium. It's got no hands out; it stays by itself. There is an ignoble one--hydrogen. It's got one hand out. There's another one--flourine. It's got one hand out. You can make the two hook up as Hydrogen-Flouride. Each had just one hand out.
>
> Sometimes you will find an atom that has two hands out, like oxygen. There you can make chains of them, and you can even join the ends of the chain and make loops of it. There ends its possibility of structure. Helium has a perfectly good logic for particles. Those with one hand out will give you minute structures. Those with two hands out give you the strings. The moment you go to an atom that has three hands out, however, you can build a molecule with any number of hands out. You simply take the one that has two hands here, another one that has two hands there, and you hook them together by their third hands. Thus out of two triads, you make a tretad, and you can build indefinitely. If you are going to build in three dimensions,

you'll want something like carbon; its got four hands out, and you can get three-dimensional structures. For these kinds of relations, we do not have an appropriate logic.[2]

McCulloch summarizes in this manner:

> The relations we need are triadic, not diadic. Once you give me triadic relations, I can make N-adic relations; but out of diadic relations, I can't get anywhere. I can build strings and I can build circles, and then it ends...
> ...How do things really get organized? They don't do it by the simple structural roles that we are able to dream up in our logic. The problem is one of relations for which we do not have a proper mode of thinking. I don't care whether it is knots or water molecules or human behavior...
>
> Long ago, Heinze Von Foerster made a movie that is four-dimensional. Small children accepted it and had no trouble with it. The adult refused it. He gets retinal rivalry; he does something else to wipe it out, but he won't tolerate the fourth dimension in his visual field. He's got two eyes; so has a child. Two eyes should be able to give you a four-dimensional field to work with. We have trained ourselves to live in a reduced sense, and it's very hard, once you've got those goggles on, to take them off again. I think if we start with a small child and keep his ability to think as rich as it naturally is, we could make great strides. We are probably not as bright as we were when we were five years old.[3]

Such is the text from which I will develop my commentary of John Stewart's paper. Let's see what we can do with it.

I firmly agree with Stewart that the development of self actualized persons must become a central factor in our education efforts. However, I have some concern that we don't create a spit between us over the concept of "Roots." If Stewart thinks of roots as being those instruments, structures, existences, etc. which will function CURRENTLY to bring substance to our beings, I'm with him. If he sees "roots" as dead appendages and prefixes to the present moment of living I choose not to concur. I enjoy the history of men and things and ideas as I would a story or in a search for past experiences which may help me understand present being. I try not to fall into the trap of feeling and believing that the past is also the now. The past is done and cannot be operated on, changed, not maneuvered except in fantasy and fiction. It can be studied only through artifact and/or symbols and reinterpreted as new immediate moments give us added interpretive tools. It does not however,

lead us to an understanding of the intentional aspects of our communication behavior in any given moment.

So, I want to look at the roots now living...now present...and very much a part of every dyadic interaction. What John Stewart does, I think, is talk about some assumptions relative to dyadic communication which may allow us to experience it in a more knowing manner...no matter what our intention may be.

I think McCulloch was attempting to challenge us to come up with better assumptions than most of those Stewart speaks of. Even so, I must remember that McCulloch as a neurophysiologist, was coming from a set of assumptions quite similar to those of phenomenology which Stewart so clearly defines. I see this set of assumptions as the effort to deal with the intentional factor of human consciousness, i.e., the meeting of subject and object in consciousness. In this respect John Stewart hasn't lost his way.

In fact, from my view of the world, the statement of W.A. Luijpen on page 9 of Stewart's paper really starts something exciting.[4] Maybe here is a way toward a triadic model of significance. Thus, one plus one equal two. But two is neither of the ones! It is a third entity.

The search for the events in which intentional consciousness is at work is identified in the encounter between subject and object. And, to understand this we must "penetrate to the roots" as Stewart would say. The examination can be likened to the exploration of the roots of a tree. Deep within them are pre-set systems...intentions...constantly being called upon to provide function to the external tree. Likewise with man and his reticular system starting behind the nose and going to the base of the spine. ("Where the tail is supposed to be connected", as McCulloch might say.) McCulloch demonstrates that the reticular system is capable of infinite adaptation in order to continue its pre-determined function. Thus our search of the living current roots of human interaction may need to seek these kinds of functions which are constants in our dyadic system. Having unearthed those we may then begin the search for a theory of consciousness which would include some basis for an analysis of the behaviors from a triadic base.

As we search for these roots in the living person in the contact of his immediate present we come clearly upon Feuerbach's thesis that man's being is in the unity of person with person. Let's begin with this assumption. Buber, as Stewart has interpreted him, poses the concept of I-Thou-Persons-In-Relation. Here, clearly, is the triad. Stewart touches it but doesn't dig it out. I-Thou-Relationship! One plus One and two follows. Stewart's confirmation is there, however, and I really believe

from his statement that he is in touch with the concept. He does recognize the triadic necessity of humanness.

Historically (if I may violate my own precept for a moment) as well as in our Now we experience the triad as a fantastically powerful being. The triangle is the most stable of the structural forms. The troika in political life (or triumvirate) has shown great power. Pyramids are fantastic structures with untold power in capturing, preserving, and transforming life elements and energy. The religious trinity is common in several religions of the world.

In contrast to these apparent recognitions of the power of the triad our social, political, economic, and interpersonal constructs seem to be depending on assumptions of binary or dyadic nature. We are constantly dealing with either-or, yes-no, stop-go, dead-alive, up-down, in-out, plus-minus, pass-fail, open-closed, love-hate, right-wrong, etc. In the face of this our predominant religious concepts are all based on forms of trinity. It seems that wherever we turn and at whatever level of consciousness we explore we find a denial of this binary error of human existence. And, in spite of the power of the triadic concepts we consistently attempt to force our perceptual systems into binary molds. They just won't fit!

Des Chardin says that there is you and me and then as we experience one another (called relating) a new organism comes into being. With the creation of the new organism you and me are not lost but we, together, have created a new essence. One plus One and Two!

Loraine Haflen, a Communication Counsellor in Denver is working now to develop a functional concept of the "spiritual child" which she sees as the inevitable offspring of a dyadic interaction. She suggests that unlike the creation of physical children, there are no available contraceptives for the "spiritual children" which emerge from each interpersonal relationship. Thus, if we take her assumption and broaden it, every dyadic interaction creates a new being. The responsibility for the nature of that being becomes very heavy! That "spiritual child" never dies. If it is born in a dyad of deceipt, exploitation, manipulation, usury, it will be deformed, ugly, rejected and abandoned but never dead. Once created, these beings become the really permanent extension of the dyadic communication persons-event.

I have, in the past, had difficulty understanding this condition even though I was aware of its being. Two years ago when what I thought was a relationship born in honesty, curing, love, and mutual awareness became suddenly abandoned by my loved one, I could not understand why I could not shake off nor destroy in memory, feeling, being...the essences

of our relationship over the previous six or seven years. They are with me now, although my view of them may be different or may change I am now aware that the reality which she and I created by our relationship will not perish.

Properly nourished, honestly and lovingly cared for, this new essence created by two persons in a dyadic relationship can be a glorious being. Improperly conceived, nourished and treated it becomes an ugly, brutal cruelty which seeks to destroy its parents and anyone else who encounters it. And often the destruction is actually physical.

To me, therefore, the essence of growth promoting communication in the dyadic setting is the understanding and development of the real triad which comes to be: one and one and two! This phenomenon appears to be a very human unity which is supportive and creative and transcends any part of the dyad.

The vital roots to our being are in the NOW! They are here for us to find as they function to fulfill the like-giving functions and to provide the living and current being with its psychic and physical sustinence. Sure they have a past...but it is not the past which is now working! I think John Stewart only touched with a slight breath the core of what I have been saying. I look forward to our interaction here to see what kind of a being we can create from our interaction.

Stewart addresses himself much too briefly to the issues of how we create climates of learning to allow persons to become more effective at creating the kinds of essences which enhance and advance the human condition. The climate of learning issue, it seems to me, is more critical than the lengthy exposition engaged in by both of us in philosophical fantasia. I would like to see some realistic revision of the educational structure so as to open it up to persons wanting to grow. Much of what we do now prescribes and inhibits real growth toward maximizing the human potential.

We have made a great deal of the issues of dyadic communication in an attempt to grasp the nature of its being and its function. And, I think we are making significant advances in understanding and awareness of the process and its promise. But, in the face of these "moon shots" of the communication business we are faced with an educational system which still operates on ox-cart principles and practices.

The curriculum and the rigid instructional modes of the public schools as well as colleges and universities is so inhumane that it is little wonder we have not truly destroyed ourselves. We measure our productivity in terms of the number of human subjects to whom we can hand little bits of paper with words about degrees inscribed on them.

These subjects have a strange and fearful similarity. In fact the final ceremony clothes them all in robes which destroy the individual identity of the person. What a travesty on a system aimed at developing and preserving the individual in his society. We are still even making our "subjects" march together in rows, columns, and phalanxes. This is the measure of the effectiveness of dyadic communication? This is the measure of the effectiveness of the institution responsible for creating environments where people may become more of themselves and less of someone else? I believe we have not only forfeited our values but also our possibilities of survival. Individuals can't survive such lock-step culturization.

You may wonder how this fits into a commentary on John Stewart's paper and this conference on "Communication and Growth Promoting Behavior". I believe it is absolutely necessary that we confront the condition of the educational environment in relation to communication as well as in respect to its real concern for human personal growth.

James A. Harris, President of N.E.A. testified recently regarding the gross failure of our education system. Note the following:

-Nearly two million school aged children are not in school. (Maybe they are the lucky ones)
-Of those who attend more will spend time in correctional institutions than will in higher learning.
-Of every 100 students now attending school 23 drop out, 77 graduate from high school, 43 enter college, 21 receive a A.A. or equivalent baccalaureate degree, 6 earn an M.S. or M.A. and 1 gets a Ph.D. (and maybe that 1 Ph.D. per 100 is too many at that level to represent accurately the state of learning that it maybe should represent.)

What's going on here? We're talking about growth promoting behavior and denying a goodly segment of our learning population a chance. On the other hand, let's assume that the educational schooling atmosphere is not particularly the best place to aid and promote growth behavior. Where else do we go where the resources are so large? We're talking about growth promoting behavior in dyadic communication and the greater portion of our classrooms are dominated by lecturers spewing out ancient and redundant data which few students ever really make a part of their growth behavior. What they (the students) learn to do is pass tests, con teachers, and screw the administration! Maybe they know more than we do about dyadic communication. It's just possible that our students grow in spite of us instead of with our aid.

How do we deal with this contradiction in our purpose and behavior? Surely a large part of it is hooked up to our own professional failure to develop more effective and viable learning opportunities in dyadic communication and to recognize that this, indeed, is the base of human interaction. For example, we train thousands of students yearly in public speaking where only a hundred or so will ever be public speakers at the level we are trying to push them to. But all of us engage in the dyadic interaction...and most of us pay little or no attention to the nature of the "spiritual children" we create thereby.

I would like to see the so-called academic disciplines merge into a unified non-discipline discipline. This unity could well be based on human growth and self actualization. We are no longer at a point where we can allow the provincialism of the academic jungle to dominate and restrict our own personal growth and becoming, much less that growth of our students. It now does both. Now we are dealing with philosophies and processes in growth when the very atmosphere where we would bring these into action is stifling and humanistically unnourishing. The tragic consequences of our past methods and current ones too, are so very real today...and yet I see no signs of change nor growth in our systems.

Enid Reed, in her Commencement Address at UCLA on Sunday June 16, 1974 said:

> ...little of our education has been concerned with ethics or morality or self examination. Yet each of us knows that these have been our central concerns...

I have felt and seen this concern by students for their self growth becoming more intense for over a decade. This makes them easy prey to charlatans, unqualified leaders and teachers, and hosts of organizations whose profit-making efforts are capitalizing on the "touchy-feelies" in order to make money rather than to assist in the personal growth of the people who pay the fees and go through the dance. At the same time well designed and substantive interpersonal encounter and other forms of developing awareness are being stained with the slop of the clumsy and unethical procedures in the hands of even more unethical practitioners in education, medicine, psychiatry, business, and a host of other institutional settings. No formal accreditation system is going to solve this one. It takes more and deeper understanding of the nature of the communication dyad and what it does to our humanity.

To me the most crucial questions in the application of growth promoting communication in the Dyadic setting are:

1. How do we create a true learning atmosphere in our educational systems which allows maximum development of the persons who become

parties to the dyads and who create so many third beings?
2. How do we create and encourage a shift to the triadic concept of human interaction so as to provide greater human existence?
3. How can we translate what we know and will be discovering into useful information and experiences to enhance the nature of our dyadic encounter?

I like what John Stewart did in his paper for me...he started me thinking...and feeling...and I'm getting ready for some action!

References

1. Warren S. McCulloch, "Commentary.." in Communication Theory and Research, Lee Thayer, Ed. pp. 413. ff.

2. Ibid., p. 417-123

3. John Stewart, "Where Are Our Roots? Crucial Questions in the Application of Growth-Promoting Communication in the Dyadic Setting." p. 9

EXAMINING THE ROOTS

RESPONSE TO JOHN STEWART'S PAPER ON CRUCIAL QUESTIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION IN THE DYADIC SETTING

Lyle L. Miller
University of Wyoming

Introduction

After careful consideration of the position which Dr. Stewart has presented in such a thorough and scholarly fashion, I find it difficult to find any points on which to take exception. Generally his position is very consistent with that which I have developed in my own experience, and I am thoroughly in agreement with the importance of examining the roots of our comtemporary positions.

The pragmatic, application-oriented focus is equally evident and equally appropriate in the field of Education and certainly in that area in which I am most interested and involved, that of Counselor Education and Counseling. In this field, too, we have had a tendency to overstress the practical in recent years and sometimes to disregard the vast pool of background in philosophical and psychological foundations on which we have to draw. I am often reminded, however, of a statement once made by one of my graduate school professors that a good theory is perhaps one of the most practical tools with which to work.

My own experiences in the dyadic relationships have been largely in the area of my work as a counselor or in the education of other counselors. Consequently, my reactions can best be understood against a background of a definition of the term counseling. This term is used in the following context:

> Counseling is the major guidance service. Counseling is the process in which an experienced and qualified person assists a second person to understand himself and his opportunities, to make appropriate adjustments and decisions in the light of this insight, to accept personal responsibility for his choices, and to follow courses of action in harmony with his choices.[1]

Counseling implies an ultimate concern about growth promoting behavior and about the conditions of the dyadic relationship that encourage a maximum development of positive self concepts and self discipline or personal responsibility. Counselors, then, should be deeply concerned

about the theory behind their practice, and frequent in-depth explorations of their philosophical and psychological backgrounds certainly should be appropriate professional behavior.

The two major roots discussed by Dr. Stewart certainly exist for me, too. When asked to define my philosophical base, I often reply that I see myself primarily as being an existential-phenomenologist with strong overtones of pragmatism. In all honesty, however, I must admit to occasional evidences of some idealism and some realism. I hope that I demonstrate some maturity and some flexibility in my personal integration and application of these philosophical foundations.

Additional Roots

In considering the root of philosophical anthroplogy as presented by Dr. Stewart, I have the feeling that I am meeting an old friend under a different name, and I sense an identification with the feelings expressed but a certain confusion in semantic concepts. The references to Einstein and Korzybski are significant to me, but some further elaboration of the concepts of relativity and of Einstein's emphasis on "time" as a fourth dimension might have helped me to identify more closely. A further recognition of one of their contemporaries, Kurt Lewin, and his efforts in the area of topological psychology would also have served to draw me more closely to this concept.

Realizing that Dr. Stewart was forced, with limits of time and space, to limit his presentation, I realize that he may have strong feelings about other roots as well, but felt he did not have time to include them. Recognizing his early reference to psychological and philosophical roots, I was disappointed not to find more reference to psychological roots in his paper. For me, the roots of "developmental psychology" and of "psychology of personality" would be equally important to the philosophical and anthropological roots he presented. With the realization that these roots introduce still another area in which we have extensive publication and widely differing views and in which we risk still further depths of confusion, still the "man-in-interaction with his environment" seems to me to fade into a faceless non-entity without this other major root of understanding. Perhaps this is only my bias as one who is concerned primarily with the uniqueness of each individual.

The Ranges of Existentialism

As Dr. Stewart points out, considerable confusion exists about the basic concept of existentialism and its theoretical implications. I agree that most philosophers in this field support Rollo May's stress on

centering on the existing person and emphasizing the human being as an emerging or becoming entity.[2] The emphasis on emerging and becoming implies a depth of time perspective which many writers seem to ignore, however. It also overlooks the possibility that the matter of individual freedom may be a very relative factor which must be viewed in different perspectives as one develops throughout the life span. In commenting on existential theory in my book Counseling Leads and Related Concepts, stress the importance of the counselor dealing with this complexity:

> Man and environment are perceived as a unit. The counselor's role in his relationship with the client is the perception of, bringing forth, and development of the client's total human existence. Experience is the essence of this existence. The individual is viewed as a dynamic entity who is constantly evolving his being through contact with the world, with other people and with himself.[3]

Many of the critics of existentialism focus their concerns on the implications of Sartre's position of emphasis on the individual as the absolute chooser. These arguments that environmental circumstances often deny freedom of choice usually stimulate the response that the indivudal always has the choice to evade that particular environment by moving, getting out, or rejecting the experience as inappropriate to him. This aspect of the exercise of individual freedom as an evasive or rejecting chain of reactions leads to the position of radical separation and existential loneliness which exemplifies the pessimistic and depressing overtones in Sartre's work. The failure to take a free stand rather than to escape or avoid the situation, leads to continued frustration and narrowing of choices, as expressed by Adrian Van Kaam:

> The very absence of a unique, free stand invites sadistic control and enslavement by the people around them. The suppressed, unique 'I' in turn develops a deep hate, a limitless rage against the oppressors which further paralyzes growth and movement.[4]

In our own culture, the last two decades seem to abound with illustrations of young people who have embraced this kind of existentialism so enthusiastically that it has led them to the ultimate existence in some "hippie haven" or some other extreme of dissassociation from the culture of their home and family.

Kierkegaard, May, Beck and others argue that there are other more meaningful and more positively oriented aspects of existentialism. Adrien Van Kaam seems to be a spokesman for this point of view when he tries to interpret existentialism for the practicing counselor.

> Existential psychology retains awareness of the limits of freedom revealed by the psychologies of factual determinants, yet it transcends determinism by its recognition of man's radical freedom which is equally observable in his behavior as his physiological and environmental determinants.[5]

Contemplation of the implications of Einstein's emphasis on "time" as a meaningful fourth dimension of reality, one realizes that the claim that existential man has the freedom to choose is not an absolute but a factor very relative to the stages of the developmental process and the environmental press. This is recognized by Carl Rogers when he said that to be one's self meant "to find the pattern, the underlying order, which exists in the ceaselessly changing flow of one's experience."[6]

The same concern for explanation of undercurrents of behavior is expressed by those who maintain that there are fundamental cycles of behavior which may be identified as "biorhythms". These uniquely different cycles of physical, emotional, intellectual and physiological aspects of personality, if firmly established, would deny the acceptance of freedom of choice, except as one understood and integrated these fundamental patterns into his pattern of choice and action. Van Kaam reflects this same concern for forces beyond one's area of control when he says:

> The world of meaning is not freely chosen. It is the outcome of traumatic experiences which influence his life without his being able to do anything about it....our behavior is a response to what the world means to us.[7]

These observations lead one to question the extreme existential position that we, as humans, really do have the power to create ourselves, or whether in fact, we are limited to an endless attempt to achieve more control over our continuous process of development. Again from the perspective of time available to us, Van Kaam points out that no individual can live long enough to experience existentially all of the possible projects of existential integration as a prerequisite to selecting the ones best suited to him. He concludes:

> The only way open to him is to make one of the already existing projects his own and to live in it in a personal way...The integration of existence is subtle and complex; its dependence on a cultural project means a dependency on human encounters from infancy on.[8]

The existentialist then must recognize that his world and his freedom are limited. The "Golden Rule" from the Bible has always provided a guideline for evaluating how far one's freedom can extend without imposing on the freedom of others. One has many opportunities to observe how his freedom and that of his associates are closely intermingled in a continuing series of encounters. As he becomes older he realizes that he is

also surrounded by "laws" and "taboos" which are based on invasions of another person's freedoms by unknown individuals at other times in the past. Sometimes these restrictions seem very unreasonable and inappropriate and create challenges to individual and collective initiative. Van Kaam's position on this process of dealing with limitations is covered in part by the comments:

> Actual freedom in evaluation and behavior does not belong to man from the first moment of conception and birth. Man must conquor his freedom. The first responses which he made to the world as a little child were usually not free, but very much conditioned by the situation of his immediate environment. In the course of his maturation, he has to transcend increasingly this unfree aspect of his life.
>
> It is a great wisdom to be satisfied within the limited freedom that each person can reach. Many people who come into counseling suffer from lack of freedom because other people have pushed them beyond their own limits.[9]

Within the time sequence of one's development, however, each individual has the opportunity to examine and evaluate many of the values and limits which seem to have been imposed on him by his world. The framework of the counseling relationship is one which is designed to make this process less threatening and more productive. In this process, Rogers points out that "the person increasingly discovers that his own organism is trustworthy, that it is a suitable instrument for discovering the most satisfying behavior in each immediate situation."[10] He further points out:

> Another trend is evident in this process of becoming a person related to the source or locus of choices and decisions, or evaluative judgments. The individual increasingly comes to feel that this locus of evaluation lies within himself. Less and less does he look to others for approval or disapproval; for standards to live by; for decisons and choices. He recognizes that it rests within himself to choose.[11]

Van Kaam expresses this same concern for the development of the individual in the following expression of concern for his counselee:

> Becoming free not only means that he will be able to freely change behavior that is undesirable in his life, but it also means that he comes to those evaluations, attitudes and behavior patterns which are desirable, but which, up to this moment, were only imposed additions to his personality. Making the impersonal become personal, rooting the unrooted, assimilating the unassimilated, ratifying the unratified, therefore is as much an essential part of the process of discovering

freedom as the transcendance of perceptions and the behavior which are compatible with the totality of one's personality. My counselee has to find out how to be free.[12]

The process of achieving control over one's developmental processes and one's understanding and perception of his own world of existence is, of course, a never-ending process, and from the viewpoint of writers like Van Kaam, the position of freedom of choice is an ever-expanding, but never completely attained situation. Van Kaam's recognition of maturiy as a relative, but limited, concept is revealed thus:

> Being really free and mature does not mean that he is no longer essentially dependent like other people, but only that he need not lean exclusively on the tradition and can form personal evaluations in certain situations. Free and mature existence means above all that one becomes severely aware of the limited number of situations in which he can trust his own appraisal and of the many more numberous situations in which he is compelled by his limitations to rely on traditional or communal wisdom.[13]

From another perspective, this increasing maturity may be defined as the achievement of greater autonomy. The possibilities of attaining a reasonable degree of autonomy are expressed by Johnson and Rourk:

> The inner-directed person adopted early in life a small number of values and principles which he rigidly adheres to no matter what the situation in which he finds himself is like. The other-directed person receives guidance and direction from the people he relates to; his behavior conforms rigidly to whatever is necessary to gain the approval of other people. The autonomous person is liberated from rigid adherance to parental values or to social pressures and expectancies. He flexibly applies his values and principles in order to behave in ways appropriate to the situations he is in...Self actualization is dependent upon being autonomous.[14]

The Confusion of Phenomenology

The confusion explored so comprehensively by Dr. Stewart is perhaps one of the irreconcilable truths about phenomenology. Perhaps we are doomed to a lifetime of continued confusion as we seek to become more knowledgeable of this concept. In general, however, I believe we can subscribe to the concept of the phenomena being a "relationship between a conscious subject and some aspect of the world." The latter may be a fact, an event or another conscious subject. A client brings to his counselor a human world made up of many phenomena, complex in their interrelationships, He brings a "whole universe in which he breathes, perceives and lives, for nothing exists for any human being that does not

have a certain meaning for him." [15] Not only is the individual seen in this complex universe of many interrelated phenomena, but he may also find it impossible to isolate his identification with any one phenomenon. Henry A. Murray points out that "at any single moment an individual may be engaged in a multiple of proceedings...if the individual's behavior is examined closely, one will discover a number of overlapping proceedings occurring simultaneously." [16] Even if one were able to isolate a single phenomena for study, time would move so rapidly that complete and clear understanding would be obliterated by the ensuing occurrence of many other proceedings or events.

Perhaps, then, our confusion about phenomenology is that we are trying to find the wrong things. We are seeking objectivity in specific factors which change and merge too rapidly. We are seeking reliability in a world of changing values and changing forces. We are seeking validity in a dynamic and expanding process of individual growth. We face the same problem that we would of recovering an object dropped into the tumbling waters of a roaring mountain stream. Perhaps we should accept the fact that reality in the relationship of man and his world can be viewed only in terms of its relativity to time and place, and that any one item of reality is constantly being eroded by the evolvement, emergence or integration with other items of reality. Only by stopping man's dynamic involvment with his evolving world could we obtain a sound base for a pure and scientific examination of the objective facts of any given phenomena, and that would leave us in the sterile position of trying to take the pulse of a corpse.

This brings us back to a more careful look at the "conscious subject" who is party to this passing parade of multidimensional phenomena. Here the root of psychology of personality seems to me to be significant as a tool to help us understand the total growth process. Although man's personality is accepted to be in a continuous process of growth and development, certain characteristics exist in sufficient continuity to justify analysis. Two dominant factors of personality development have been expressed by Jung, as reported by Hall and Lindzey.

> Jung's view of man combines teleology with causality. Man's behavior is conditioned not only by his individual and racial history (causality) but also by his aims and aspirations (teleology). Both the past as actuality and the future as potentiality guide one's present behavior. Jung's view of personality is prospective in the sense that it looks ahead to the person's future line of development, and retrospective in the sense that it takes account for the past. This insistence on the role of destiny or purpose in human development set Jung clearly apart from Freud. [17]

The nature of the components of the "thinking person" have been the subject of exploration and debate among psychologists for many years, and reactions in this area produce as complex and confusing an area as that of phenomenology itself. All attempts to measure the individual lead to the conclusion that man can only be measured "in situation" and this introduces again all of the problems of rapid change.

Murray would argue that understanding of the thinking person could be obtained by analysis of his needs and he suggests a classification of twenty needs for such a study: "Abasement, Achievement, Affiliation, Aggressions, Autonomy, Conteraction, Defendance, Deference, Dominance, Exhibition, Harm Avoidance, Infaavoidance, Nurturance, Order, Play, Rejection, Sentience, Sex, Succorance, Understanding."[18]

Allport believes that traits can be identified and traced as one approaches maturity. He points out:

> Not all adults achieve full maturity. There are grown individuals whose motivations still smack of the nursery. Not all adults seem to guide their behavior in terms of clear, rational principles. However, the extent to which they avoid unconscious motivation and the degree to which their traits are independent of childish origins represent a measure of their normality and maturity.[19]

Trying to apply some of Einstein's concepts of relativity, however, Lewin urges primary attention to the broad field of life space with its interaction of the person with his psychological environment, with attention to specific areas of interaction to come only as secondary steps of our study. According to Hall and Lindzey:

> Lewin maintains it is essential to start with an over-all picture of psychological reality, a picture of the greatest general validity, and then proceed, step by step, to differentiate out of this broad panorama the details by which a precise understanding of the concrete psychological situation can be achieved. The circle in the ellipse represents Lewin's three main components, the person, the psychological environment and the total life space of man in environment.[20]

Lewin spent considerable time in trying to identify appropriate subdivisions of life space and of boundaries between such subdivisions. His concepts of permeability of growth walls and of processes for assimilating new phenomena as they occur are complex but logical. They seem to have provided a basis for the development of meaningful counseling relationships and are recognized by both Rogers and Van Kaam in their discussions of the counseling process. Van Kaam summarizes his feeling about client growth as follows:

> My counselee should grow to the wisdom that even his existence, regardless of his maturity, training, and education, always remains to some degree dependent on tradition, for existence is fundamentally coexistence. This means that it is essentially depended on the wisdom of other people in the past and present. Tradition is an embodiment of this coexistential wisdom. [21]

Education as an Anthropological Process

Undoubtedly my background in pragmatism and pedagogy has dimmed my perspective and made it difficult for me to comprehend fully the root of philosophical anthropology as presented by Dr. Stewart. However, I am convinced that our educational system is one basic example of man's anthropological and cultural development. The educational system is one of the primary means by which we try to transmit our culture from generation to generation. Without it, the preservation of our heritage might be very difficult indeed. Certainly the explorations of the questions "What is Man?" and "How does Man develop?" are fundamental to all of our statements of educational philosophy which have been so carefully written in so many schools and which are often carefully and securely filed away in the executive files.

Unfortunately the more simple principles explored by Dr. Stewart have not had the acceptance and recognition they deserve in many educational settings. Certainly most educators would agree that "humanness is an interpersonal process." However, it does not follow that we organize our educational system around the concept that study and learning must have personal relationships. Conern about our gaps between philosophy and practice is expressed quite well by Stanford and Rourk:

> Education is a continuous process which occurs as a result of interaction with other human beings. Considering the process of education as essentially social does not deny the importance of information or skill training, but it does change the position they occupy in the process. The key to the type and quality of the educational experience is shifted from the information involved, to the human interaction involved. Social interaction and social learning become the essence of education while traditional subject matter becomes an ingredient in the interaction. [22]

Our counseling relationships should provide one of the best opportunities for developing human and interpersonal aspects of the educational process. Carl Rogers expresses a concern for this relationship, however, when he says: "Acceptantly to be what I am, and to permit this to show through to the other person, this is the most difficult task I know and one I never fully achieve." [23] He goes on to say later: "The degree to

which I can create relationships which facilitate the growth of others as separate persons is a measure of the growth I have achieved in myself." [24]

Within our society we are very dependent on our communication skills to create these relationships in which growth toward maturity and personal freedom can flourish and grow. Each of us has many opportunities each day to build these kinds of relationships. Stanford and Rourk stress: "Facilitative relationships are characterized by trust and openness." [25] Teachers or leaders must be congruent (real, consistent, not phoney), empathetic, and capable of practicing unconditional positive regard (for persons, not necessarily for what they do). In teaching, counseling and other interpersonal relations we need to achieve a freedom from threat. We need to create a safe, secure, personal relationship in which the other "thinking person" can be allowed to achieve an optimal climate for developing a deeper understanding of his own phenomenal relationships.

Summary

Considering all of the complexity of all of the roots presented, (existentialism, phenomenology, anthropology and psychology), one does not find it surprising to note great divergence of though in our published materials in any professional field. For each writer or speaker, his own words make sense in his own phenomenological field. Existentially he is right and mature -- for himself. The only way to maintain our sanity in a world of confusion must lie in our own ability to reach a level of existence where we sort out our own facts and discriminate between those which mesh smoothly with our established existential field, those that stimulate us to further expansion and growth, and those which we must regard as totally inconsistent with our own pattern of development.

One final point which impresses me. Our topic has been focused on the dyadic relationship, and my experience as a counselor and counselor educator has been highly concentrated on the dyadic, face to face relationship between two people. This personal encounter between individuals has seemed to be the most significant phenomenon. In recent years, however, I have been impressed with the argument that many problems do not arise in such dyadic relationships. Many problems arise in the social milieu, with many overlapping incidents contributing to the birth of the concerns. Murray's convictions that many phenomena often occur simultaneously, and Moreno's concerns for therapeutic activities in groups strengthen my conviction that this is becoming increasingly an area for productive professional activity. I am very happy to see that these concerns for communication in group settings will be developed at greater depth later in this conference.

NOTES

[1]Lyle L. Miller, Counseling Leads and Related Concepts (Laramie: Developmental Reading Distributors, 1970), p. 2.

[2]Rollo May, "The Emergence of Existential Psychology," in Existential Psychology, ed. Rollo May, 2nd ed. (New York: Random House, 1960), p. 11

[3]Miller, p. 21

[4]Adrian Van Kaam, The Art of Existential Counseling (New York: Dimension Books, 1966), p. 56.

[5]Ibid., p. 165.

[6]Carl Rogers, On Becoming A Person (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1961), p. 115.

[7]Van Kaam, p. 63

[8]Ibid., p. 130

[9]Ibid., pp. 64, 68.

[10]Rogers, p. 118

[11]Ibid., p. 119

[12]Van Kaam, p. 66.

[13]Ibid, p. 111.

[14]David W. Johnson, Reaching Out (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972), p. 3.

[15]Van Kaam, p. 61.

[16]H. A. Murray, "Murray's Personology," in Theories of Personality, Calvin S. Hall and Gardner Lindzey (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1957), p. 167.

[17]Calvin S. Hall and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1957), p. 78.

[18]H. A. Murray, Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford, 1938), pp. 152-266.

[19]Hall and Lindzey, p. 276

[20]Ibid., p. 210.

[21]Van Kaam, P. 110.

[22]Gene Stanford and Albert E. Rourk, Human Interaction in Education (Boston Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974), p. 3.

[23]Rogers, p. 51.

[24]Ibid., p. 56.

[25]Stanford and Rourk, p. 8.

CRUCIAL QUESTIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION IN THE GROUP SETTING

Small group communication has long been a major concern in our field. In more recent years, the use of small group techniques in personal growth, encounter, and sensitivity sessions has become common. The papers in this section focus upon the small group setting and personal growth. The major position paper is by Bobby Patton, University of Kansas. The responses to his paper are by Raymond Tucker and Roger D. Wimmer, Bowling Green State University and William Donaghy, University of Wyoming.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION IN THE GROUP SETTING

Bobby R. Patton

University of Kansas

In the 1960's we saw the transformation of the encounter group from a potent instrument of personal growth and development into a movement and fad attracting sensational journalistic coverage. We would read exposes of growth centers from coast-to-coast, while enthusiastic advocates of the movement would proclaim the virtues of nude marathons, communal bathing, and body awareness.

Anecdotes of atrocities and horror stories of personal abuse within encounter settings became publicized in lurid detail in the popular media. One free-lance journalist visited several encounter groups and reported such stories as the following:

> Marylou D., who is thirty-four and has never even come close to getting married, finally attended an encounter group for singles in an attempt to overcome some of her hangups about the opposite sex. "It was shattering," she told me afterward. "The first thing the girls were told to do was go up to the men they were most attracted to and act out our feelings for them. When it was my turn to do this, I decided to be very spontaneous. After all, why not? It was what we were there for. So I w[illegible] to this tall, rugged looking man -- he was the best-looking one there and therefore chosen most by us females -- and threw my arms around him. I felt good doing it, very natural. But he just stood there like a stone, avoiding my eyes. Finally he pushed me away and told me to keep my hands off him. The leader said to him, 'Good, Tom, you're expressing your hostility effectively. Let it out.' I then asked, 'What about me? I just got rejected -- how am I supposed to handle it?' The leader shrugged and said, 'You'll live.' and that was that. From then on, whenever one of the men rejected a girl, the leader gave his approval. I began to get the idea that the point of the group was to teach men how to regard women as unnecessary beings. I came away from the group feeling much more depressed about men than I had in years. I suppose there are other groups where things are different. But at this point I'd never go back to any in a million years."
>
> (Maude Poiret, Touch Me, Heel Me, Love Me, Award Books, New York, 1971, pp. 40-41)

Another form of attack was generated by "right-wing" critics. One small-town newspaper proclaimed in its headlines: "Former POW to Compare Brainwashing with Sensitivity Training Programs" (Herald Journal, Clarinda, Iowa, Vol. III, No. 50, June 20, 1969). The story said in part:

> Sensitivity training and sex education will be discussed by retired Lt. Col. Jack Mohr at Wibholm Hall at 8 p.m., July 1. His speech is entitled, "Blastoff to Subversion -- A Planned Program of Mental Slavery."
>
> The program is being sponsored by POMS, a newly organized group of Parents Organized for Moral Stability. The organization is an out-growth of previous sessions discussing sex education in the schools.
>
> Mohr was the first U.S. military man to experience brainwashing techniques by the North Korean communists. As a U.S. Army advisor to the Korean Army, Col. Mohr was captured in 1948 by the North Koreans. He reports being tortured for days, abused and "experimented with," undergoing some of the early brainwashing treatments. He finally stood before a firing squad and was miraculously rescued through the efforts of a Korean friend.
>
> "Sensitivity training is the cultural cousin of what was known during the Korean War as brainwashing," Col. Mohr observes. "The Chinese had a better word for it; they called it thought control."
>
> "A nationwide program is now underway to digress, degrade and pervert our people in the schools. They are substituting for the three R's what I'll call the three S's: sin, sex, and sensitivity," he believes.
>
> Col. Mohr adds, "Sensitivity training asks only that we give up everything we believe in exchange for a belief in nothing in order that we disagree with no one."

Moving from this rather negative prologue, I would like to consider with you from a more positive, constructive perspective my views on the T-group or encounter group as the arena for growth-promoting communication. Typically, in such an experience, from ten to twenty individuals face the task of creating, developing, and maintaining a small social organization -- a miniature society -- within a relatively short but concentrated period of time. This emerging social organization faces genuine, difficult problems of social formation, individual relationships, and work achievement. Although the T-group is a miniature society, it has aspects not typically found in other social organizations. Peculiar to the T-group

is the process of inquiry, experimentation, and exploration into its own activities. Peculiar, at least for the most part is its sole purpose of helping individuals to learn; the process of developing a group in which to learn becomes the means for achieving personal growth.

This limitation in the focus of my paper is not intended to deny the growth potential within task-oriented groups (See Bobby R. Patton and Kim Giffin, Problem-Solving Group Interaction, Harper and Row, New York, 1973). The T-group, however, is unique in that its basis for existence is to permit growth-producing communication. While the T-group and its task are unique, they are not artificial. The group in its beginning has blurred or ambiguous fundamental ingredients of social organizations, such as authority and power structure, processes of goal formation, norms of personal and group behavior, procedures for productivity, and expectations for leader and member behavior. These ambiguities must be reduced through the hard work of the group's members. Their efforts at establishing relationships and solving problems provide the communication behaviors that can in turn provide the bases for personal learning.

From the many questions and concerns that I feel are worthy of serious attention, I have decided to devote my attention to three that I feel are truly critical:

1. What should be the investment and area of expertise for the speech communication scholar and teacher within the "human potential movement"?
2. What are the underlying assumptions of growth-promoting communication in the group setting?

and 3. How can a person who is experienced in developing good human relations help others to achieve growth-producing encounters?

I. The Role of the Speech Communication Scholar

Historically, those of us in the speech profession are for the most part newcomers to the "human potential movement." On my campus (The University of Kansas), an interdisciplinary program in human relations was initiated in the late 1940's building on the experiences of several of our faculty who participated in a special cooperative program with the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. Although several members of our speech faculty, including Bill Conboy and Kim Giffin, participated in this interdisciplinary program, it was not until 1966-67 that that program was officially intergrated into our department, changing the name of one of our divisions to Speech Communication and Human Relations. This union resulted from our feeling that speech communication scholarship should not be restricted to strict rhetorical constraints and that a study of small group communication cannot ignore the potential of T-groups.

Conversely, there was perceived a need for establishing some parameters upon our commitments to the discipline of human communication within the broader human potential movement.

We found ourselves in the mainstream of student aspirations and societal concerns when we introduced our freshman course in "Interpersonal Communication" in the fall of 1967. This course is followed sequentially in our curriculum by such courses as "Introduction to Human Relations," "Cases in Human Relations," "Human Relations in Group Interaction" I and II, as well as a number of "theory" courses dealing with such topics as interpersonal perception, attraction, etc.

Within the broader human potential movement, there are innumerable alternative routes to expanding the potential of people -- primal therapy, dance in several forms, massage, biofeedback, "mind-expanding" drugs, meditation, and various forms of mysticism. While I will not dispute the efficacy of these approaches or techniques for promoting growth, I do believe that they are outside the realm of expertise of the speech communication student and scholar. As Kim Giffin and I have elucidated in some detail in our recent book, Personal Communication in Human Relations (Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, 1974), we believe that our primary area of attention should be on the personal communication occurring within the group. We are not psychoanalysts or counselors; rather, we are able to be facilitative people who know the potential of the group process and trust that process in a climate of genuine openness.

On the extreme of the encounter movement is the "tricky" approach as exemplified by the nude encounter: "If you take your clothes off, we'll have more to talk about." This and other group gimmicks are called "generating data" as if the fact that each of us has been trying to live his/her life wouldn't give us enough to talk about. Bill Coulson refers factiously to such clever group activities as -- "Maybe we could get people to clean one another's ears and talk about their reactions," one was suggested. "Or pick one another's noses...." (William R. Coulson, Groups, Gimmicks, and Instant Gurus, New York, Harper and Row, 1972, pp. 6-7).

The problem with such exercises or gimmicks is not that they are magic, manipulative devices that can steal a person's spirit. What is bad is that these extreme approaches often waste time in which group participants could be making their own discoveries about their communication capabilities if there were greater freedom in the group. As Bill Coulson states:

> ...There is a kind of accelerated personal learning that can go on only in community, when learning reciprocates and everybody is open to surprise, even the leader. People just cannot

> achieve this kind of learning, the kind that can carry into life, the kind about values, without intimate contact with their fellows. Nobody learns in a vacuum. Hence the encounter group. But it can't be done quickly either, or when somebody is directing it, presenting psychological patent medicine, one elixir for all that ails the human spirit. (Ibid., pp. 11-12)

I think that there is a valid, compelling rationale for utilization of structured, predicable exercises within the classroom emphasizing development of basic communication skills; even here, however, such exercises should be selected with care given to the potential outcomes. For example, nonverbal exercises have invaded the speech classroom with a vengeance in the past few years. The techniques employed are numerous and range from simple exercises with a minimum of body contact to physically intimate and emotionally revealing designs of the kind most often associated with Esalen and its derivatives. These techniques derive their theoretical justification from the theory that stresses the possibility of achieving greater honesty and authenticity through bodily expression that can become uninhibited more quickly than can verbal communication. Thus, participants can reach deeper levels of consciousness quicker. Each of these exercises can be immensely beneficial to certain individuals -- and provide little help, or have negative results, for others. What must be made clear to everyone in our profession is determination of the purpose to be achieved, and the kind of exercises best designed to serve that purpose.

To me, I see a sharp and clear distinction between the exercises and the expectations of such instruction-designed courses in interpersonal communication -- and in the unstructured, less inhibited, open atmosphere of the T-group. In this situation, when the "teacher" or "trainer" introduces exercises designed to open people up, to fear that we may be guilty of some of the charges of coercion. I can understand the impatience, the anxious urge to create conditions for freedom, but I question if we do not unintentionally, thus create conditions of coercion, failure, and loss of freedom.

William G. Hollister ("Brainwashing vs. Strengthening Individuality," Human Relations Training News, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1969, p. 1) has cited anthropological studies of various secret societies over the world that show many groups have independently rediscovered the techniques of mind conditioning, logical analysis, decreasing discrimination, and increasing suggestibility. The Grecian mysteries of Eleusis utilized fasting, psychological abstinence, long silences, ceremonial setting and drinking, witnessing dramas, building up expectations, discussing symbolic death and rebirth, and evoking hopes and aspirations to higher levels of living. All of these experiences were built into a sequence that preceded "giving of the word" to those being initiated. Other secret initiation ceremonies utilized debilitation, embarrassment, removal of clothing or psychological disrobing, ceremonial touching,

wonder-inspiring meditation, trials, eye-to-eye or mirror looking, challenges to one's intent, inculcating a fear of rejection, conflict and exclusion, repetitive body movement and phraseology. Aristotle was reportedly thrown out of such a secret gourp because he said, "Those who are being initiated do not so much learn anything, as experience certain emotions, and are thrown into a special state of mind." Thus, some of the criticisms of our rhetorically-inclined colleagues are well-grounded!

I would add my disclaimer that the highly skilled professional in human relations may be able to use such techniques to the mutual benefit of everyone concerned. These people know the potential of the experiences and are knowledgeable concerning the consequences. What concerns me are the use of potentially potent stimuli in the hands of the teacher whose best rationale for their use is that "they really get the students involved" or "turned on to my course." I recall vividly and with pain the report that a high school teacher was giving to a gathering concerning the high degree of involvement and emotionalism produced by some fantasy explorations and intimacy games.

Perhaps there is a similarity to such devices within the group setting and with persuasive techniques that can be used either for manipulative or for freedom-giving purposes. For those of us whose avowed goal is to strengthen individuality and to avoid inducing conformity and the control of minds, we must carefully examine our goals and intent when we are within a group. I concur heartily with Bill Coulson when he states:

> The particular potency of the encounter group lies in its being an occasion for the individual to know himself better, to be able to decide for himself about himself; no expert is able to direct him as well as he can himself upon entering community with his fellows. At its best, the encounter group is thus a benign anarchy, where if participants accrue similar learnings it is only because it turns out that way, never because it can be arranged in advance. All the learnings are private, individual ones, to which the group has no claim whatsoever. (Ibid., p. 13)

II. Underlying Assumptions

Let us begin by examining some of the basic assumptions stated by Bill Schutz concerning human relations training (W.C. Shutz, An Approach to the Development of Human Potential. A report of the 1963 Continuing Human Relations Laboratory at Bethel, Maine, August 15, 1963). His first assumption was that it is good to free a person to experience the world more fully. The more the sensations that the individual is able to experience, the better. The second assumption was that human events that are experienced primarily in a cognitive manner are incomplete. The

development of feelings and emotions allows experience to be felt and integrated into the self. "Noting the beauty of a sunset without feeling an internal glow, achieving without feeling -- these are but partial experiences" (Shutz, 1963). The third assumption was that the unconscious plays a crucial role in learning and emotional development; that childhood experiences and unresolved emotional problems can cause blocks, defenses, and distortions that can seriously curtail the individual's openness.

At least three major questions come to mind regarding Schutz's assumptions. First, is it valid to assume that complete openness to experience is necessary to self-awareness and self-acceptance? What is the relevance of the literature that suggests that people are finite (e.g., George A. Miller, "Communication and Information as Limiting Factors in Group Formation," Mimeographed manuscript, Harvard University, 1957); that one way to maintain an emotional balance is to learn how to censor and limit competently the number of stimuli that a person will admit to his/her consciousness; that a key to creativity is not only openness but also skillful closedness? Second, what is the evidence that suggests that cognitive, rational experience can inhibit development or leave a person incomplete? We all would likely agree that the emotional dimensions have been too frequently suppressed where thay are relevant to competent learning. But does it follow that all growing experiences must be emotionally felt? If so, how strong must be the feeling? I know of one trainer who was not satisfied until a person could physically demonstrate affection or appreciation; verbal expression was not enough. Another spoke in terms connoting "success" in reporting that a person in the group cried as he talked about his inability to experience feelings. What are the criteria that these educators use to decide when the feelings are strong enough? Are there not any conditions that a sign of competent living is the control and perhaps the suppression of some feelings? Third, should not the emphasis be placed upon the present situation rather than the past lives of the participants? Childhood traumas may be fertile areas for the psychoanalyst, but not for the speech communication teacher.

I think that we can move from Schutz's assumptions to ones that I feel are more appropriate for members of our profession. I believe that there are several important foci for T-group training by speech-trained people:

1. The emphasis is on the present situation, not the past life of any of the members or even their present life outside the group;
2. The focus is more upon personal growth and increased human potential than upon corrective treatment;
3. Interaction among all group members equally are more important than leader-member relationships;
4. More importance is given to conscious feelings and motivation than to those at an unconscious level;

5. The aim of the group is oriented more toward new behavior patterns rather than new motivations;
6. The immediate intent of the facilitator is to improve effectiveness of behavior or change the behavior of the people in the group rather than change personality structure;

and 7. The members see themselves as normal people seeking to function more effectively at the interpersonal level rather than as abnormal people seeking treatment.

(Kim Giffin and Bobby R. Patton, Personal Communication in Human Relations, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Co., 1974, p. 26. See the book for elaboration on these assumptions.)

III. Guidelines for Achieving Growth-Producing Encounters*

Obviously I am not in sympathy with all activities in our profession done in the name of "growth-promoting communication in the group setting." I have elaborated in some detail the problems and dangers as I perceive them. There is no substitute for professional preparation in our degree programs and for common sense by practitioners.

T-groups began because there seemed to be no opportunities in our fast-paced, highly organized society for people to meet just as people, when we weren't playing roles, when we didn't feel the need to be guarded, when we weren't feeling compelled to impress one another and meet one another's expectations. Encounter groups began because we needed a place to try ourselves out, a place where performance wasn't centered, where we could take risks, make mistakes, and still stay together.

How can a person who is experienced in developing good human relations help others to achieve growth-producing encounters? In our new book, Kim Giffin and I suggested eight behaviors for the trainer or any facilitative person in a group:

1. Model productive interaction. An effective way of helping others to learn is to provide a good example. Laboratory learning includes both participating and observing. You can help others by letting them see that you believe in the process, by doing nothing to diminish the trust others are placing in you, and by demonstrating the behaviors suggested in the following guidelines.
2. Focus on the present -- "the here and now." It is helpful to talk mostly about the present, that which is mainly under

*This section of the paper relies heavily upon and quotes directly from Personal Communication in Human Relations, pp. 101-104.

the control of those persons who are currently interacting. Such "here and now" data is fresh and of primary interest, and all who are present can learn by facilitating tentative, exploratory changes in the interpersonal relationships. Actually, the "here and now focus" can include that recent past which has been experienced together by the members of a dyad or group; focusing on shared experience is of more value than trying to stick very close to the precise present.

3. Encourage the quest for personal feedback. The human relations learning paradigm is as follows:
   a. Few people are completely satisfied with themselves (i.e. their view of themselves or their self-image).
   b. Most people are interested in seeing how others, especially new acquaintances, respond to them.
   c. If there seems to be a discrepancey between their self-image and the way they appear to be seen by or to affect others, a motive for possible change (learning) has been generated.
   d. A mature person will recognize that he does not have to change just because of this discrepancey; it is his alternative or choice.
   e. Change followed by favorable feedback produces a strong learning (change) situation.

   Feedback becomes of prime importance. It can be helpful if a stable, unthreatened person encourages (but does not demand) feedback from others. This feedback consists of others telling you how they perceive you and how they feel about you.
4. Preserve individual choice regarding change. Even though feedback has been requested or subtly sought by a person and consequently received, his right to choose to change or not to change should be preserved. We know that simple behavioral changes can be induced by operant conditioning, but unless such changes are desired by the "subject", the effort can backfire, and negative attitudes plus firm resolution to "never change" can be the result. It can be helpful to others if you make certain they understand your willingness (only if sincere) to let them make the choice themselves. Many of the alleged malpractices in T-groups can be avoided if opportunity to choose to change or not change is preserved.
5. Support attempts of others to change their behavior. Once a person makes known that he has decided to try to behave differently, the early efforts at change need your support. Encouragement will be needed to attempt desired chnages, and tension induced by attempts to change may cause the person to behave in a less desirable way at first. Tolerance of tense behavior is helpful. Some persons will quietly resolve to change without communicating their commitment;

you should be alert to minor changes and encourage (reward or compliment) them in an unobtrusive (unembarrassing) way.

6. Develop helpful interaction norms. From psychotherapy and counseling studies, three ways of interacting have been identified as helpful:
   a. Show accurate empathy with the way the other person feels; showing that you know how he feels, not just why he feels that way.
   b. Extend nonpossessive warmth, i.e. regard for the other person as a person with real potential without predicting the continuation of such warmth on behavior or change desired by you. This kind of warmth has no restrictions or "strings" tied to it. (This way of interacting is not easy to achieve unless sincerely felt; it is identifiable when you and the other person have together "joined hands to face the common enemy" — his problem, anxiety, or desire to behave differently.)
   c. Behave in a way that is congruent with your feelings. Sometimes this is called "being genuine", i.e. being true to your innermost feelings, expressing your anger or anxiety when honestly felt, but still expressing it in a way that does not deny the other person nonpossessive warmth nor accurate empathy.

   Few people can actually behave in all three ways at the same time, but you should try to do some of each whenever you can. If you can help to establish these three ways of behaving as norms for your dyad or group, members can grow and help you (and others) to grow into more satisfying ways of relating to others.
7. Allow individual defensive behavior. While it is desirable to diminish artificial barriers between people, it is also very important not to tear them down too fast. Individuals who insist on maintaining themselves through defensive behavior should be allowed to do so without pressure or diatribe — so long as they have been told how they are perceived by others. The choice of changing their behavior should remain theirs.
8. Preserve human dignity. At no time in trying to relate to others does a person need to abandon basic human dignity. You can empathize and show nonpossessive warmth toward a person who is ill, dirty, ignorant, perverted, and/or vicious without becoming sick, dirty, stupid, gross, or mean. In fact, behaving like a person who is in trouble when you are with a troubled person may not be helpful to that person at all. Genuine consideration of the motives, habits, perceptions, and feelings of others is the keynote to interpersonal harmony.

   Artifacts of human dignity (for example, status symbols such as neckties and ceremonial robes which tend to separate people) may need to be laid aside. Artificial forms of separation, if clung to by one or more persons, will likely

keep them psychologically apart. But it is very important to determine behaviors and accouterments which tend to separate people and those which do not. Barriers designed to keep people apart, such as wide conference tables, should be avoided, while different colored socks (or no socks) will make no difference if it is not taken to mean a difference, i.e. a social distinction or barrier. While it is true that elimination of artificial social barriers is necessary to improve interpersonal human relations, hundreds of laboratory groups have demonstrated that people can make satisfactory progress without frolicking nude, smelling each other's armpits, or crudely degrading sexual enjoyment -- that is, without joining the oft-cited lunatic fringe of sensitivity training.

Conclusion

The encounter group is such a potent communication tool that we cannot afford to ignore it. I agree with Max Birnbaum when he stated, "...human relations training is capable, if properly employed, of producing substantial educational change. It holds tremendous potential for improving education by dealing with its affective components, reducing the unnecessary friction between generations." And I also agree with him when he proceeds to suggest that one of the most serious threats to success comes "from a host of newly hatched trainers, long on enthusiasm or entrepreneurial expertise, but short on professional experience, skill, and wisdom." (Max Birnbaum, "Sense About Sensitivity Training," Saturday Review, November 15, 1969, p. 82.)

It appears to me that what is needed in our field is a clearer sense of how laboratory training developed, the varied forms it may take, and the results that can be anticipated in any given situation. Unfortunately, not all of all can agree on the many issues raised by this kind of training, and there will be those who disagree strongly with many of the judgments presented here. But clearer delineation of the issues, wider discussion, and more careful research and analysis of results should help us in the application of growth-promoting communication in the group setting. As Pogo once said, "We are confronted with insurmountable opportunities." In my opinion that is what life is all about -- insurmountable opportunities that we struggle for the freedom to realize; each one of us at least some of them, some of the time. The more struggle, the more freedom, the more self-realization and growth.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION IN THE GROUP SETTING: A RESPONSE

Raymond K. Tucker

and

Roger D. Wimmer
Bowling Green State University

Let us state our thesis bluntly at the outset: It is that, with all of the apparent values of encounter groups, we have to date failed to engage in what we will call Level 1 research into the relationship of the encounter group to the back-home communication activities of the individual.

We find Dr. Patton's paper to be a fine description of the underlying assumptions and procedures of encounter group experiences. And his advice to those who would participate, e.g., focus on the here-and-now, is standard doctrine within the movement. In brief, we find nothing controversial in his presentation. His philosophy is clearly pro-encounter group. Ours is too. The senior author has participated in the Bethel experience and has served as trainer for numerous groups both within industry and within the academic community. He, too, shares the enthusiasm generated by Dr. Patton. And further, both of us endorse the view that T-groups are both fun and growth-promoting. But we also have a gnawing suspicion that there may be no relationship between the T-group experiences and anything else in life. And, if there is, we certainly are far from demonstrating it. And the reasons for our not demonstrating it are that, to us, the field has failed to engage in fundamental research. We have failed, to repeat an earlier phrase, to engage in Level 1 research. Let us operationalize Level 1 encounter research as follows:

(1) The identification of structure. What are the relevant variables operating within the encounter group? Which of these variables fall into clusters, factors (dimensions) and thus represent functional unities?

(2) Regularity of behavior on the variables. An essential element in this research process is the determination of the durability of the behavioral variables. Certain variables should be expected to recur again and again. Other variables might be sample-specific.

(3) How do participants behave with respect to these variables? This implies the ability of the researcher to obtain reliable measurements on the variables in question. Measurements might be, for example, self-reports, or they might result from the weighted composite ratings of trainers.

(4) The relationship to non-encounter group life situations. We dislike the term "the real world;" but sometimes it is the most descriptive phrase available. How, we ask, do the variables relate to modes of behavior in the subject's day-to-day life activities? This implies, of course, the existence of a set of variables which have been determined to be of value in the individual's relationships with other people. What we ask, then, is for the determination of how one set of variables is related to another set of variables. This is a common type of research situation. In fact, it is amazing how much of behavioral science is devoted to just such an assessment.

Basic Level 1 research, in the present instance, then, can be schematicized as follows (the quotations are from Dr. Patton's paper):

(a) "The T-group . . . is unique in that its basis for existence is to permit growth-promoting communication."
(b) The assumption that growth does in fact take place.
(c) The identification of the variables comprising such growth behavior.
(d) Study of these behavioral variables in order to determine if they recur with some regularity.
(e) Determining the variables that are considered important in the individual's "back-home" situation.
(f) The determination of how behavior in the T-group is related to behavior in the back-home situation.

Let us continue this extended example with the help of some of the items detailed by Dr. Patton. In this example, let us use the family as the basic unit of interest. And let us assume that the father of this family has participated in a well designed and executed T-group.

First, we present a rough taxonomy of behaviors which seem to generate considerable agreement among T-group theorists and trainers. Call these Set One variables; and assume, along with Dr. Patton, that they are considered valuable ways of behaving in the T-group:

1. Learning to communicate in the here-and-now.
2. Learning to encourage feedback.
3. Learning to show empathy.
4. Learning to allow individual defensive behavior.
5. Learning to preserve human dignity.

Now assume that these are the main variables existing in the typical T-group. That is, cumulative research leads us to believe that these are the variables (behavior patterns) that differentiate the T from any other group (or at least from many other groups) in our society. Assume, further, that longitudinal research assures us that these variables occur with considerable regularity. Hence they would seem to qualify as basic variables, or--in other words, as basic behavioral dimensions within the groups.

To answer the So What? question, we move into the next stage of our research. That basic question, to review for a moment, is this: how does the alleged growth-promoting experience of the T-group carry over into the life of our hypothetical father? Or, to put it even more basically, is he a better father, or better family man, by virtue of his re-education in the T-group?

We look at the "typical" father in our society and try to determine what the central variables are that make for a father who is high on the effectiveness continuum as opposed to one who is low on the continuum. Let us assume, once again that five basic dimensions fall out of the analysis. In this contrived case, we find that the American father can be differentiated on the basis of these variables:

1. Communicates with his wife and children on issues of concern to them in the here-and-now.
2. Encourages feedback.
3. Shows empathy.
4. Allows for individual defensive behavior.
5. Preserves human dignity in his family relations.

Note that the important dimensions of T-group behavior turn out to be the same dimensions important to the typical American family. The taxonomy, we repeat, is hypothetical.

Now to our central research issue. How are these two sets of variables related? In this paper we cannot be overly concerned with precision in the design. There simply is not enough space to develop the procedures. So the design is, at best, rough.

Assume a federal grant gives us the resources to investigate 500 American fathers. Ratings in the T-group setting are made by, say, three trainers on each of the 5 dimensions. Now we give each father an opportunity to put his new skills and attitudes into practice back home. We give him, say, three months. Then we have each member of his family rate him on these "family" variables. The family ratings are weighted in some way and combined into 5 composite scores, one for each dimension. Now the problem in much behavioral science research to date has been the unavailability of appropriate statistics to deal with this kind of research problem. Note that the problem resolves to this: how are the 5 measurements in the T-group related to the 5 measurements back home in the family? This ought to provide us with some indication of the effect of the T-group experience on the subjects' back-home behavior.

The reader is probably envisioning the use of a Pearson Product-Moment correlation for each set of variables; or the production of a 5 x 5 intercorrelation matrix, correlating each variable with the p - 1 remaining variables. Research of this kind is widespread in the behavioral science journals. But let us point out that with these separate correlations we never get a complete picture of how the one <u>set</u> relates to the other <u>set</u>. Clearly what is needed is a multivariate statistic. One has been available since 1935 and is known as the method of canonical correlation.[1] It is not yet in widespread use for two reasons: first, like most multivariate statistics, it had to await the development of high speed computers; and, secondly, behavioral scientists simply do not have a handle on it--they do not totally understand it.

Canonical correlation operates as follows: we are all familiar with the method of simple correlation, the Pearson Product-Moment correlation mentioned above being the most common. It simply attempts to determine the relationship existing between any two variables. Now if we add one or more variables to one side and keep a single variable on the other side, we have, in effect, the method of multiple regression. The aim of this statistic is to predict a subject's score on the criterion variable from the variables on the other side--the predictor variables. Canonical correlation goes one step further. It seeks to determine the maximum correlation existing between any two set of variables. It no longer makes any difference whether we refer to one set as predictor and the other as criterion. The method views them only as two sets of measurements.

A canonical correlation analysis provides the following information:

1. The canonical correlation coefficient (R_c) which indicates the <u>strength</u> of association between the two variable sets.
2. The canonical correlation squared (R_c^2) which indicates the amount of shared variance accounted for by the composite canonical variates.
3. Canonical component loadings (R_{cc}) for each variable which indicate the nature of relationship within and between the variable sets.
4. Chi-square significance tests which indicate whether a canonical root significantly departs from zero.

To illustrate canonical correlation, hypothetical results of the T-group, family research program are provided below. The basic relationship existing within the two variable sets is arrayed as a series of correlations (canonical component loadings). These are the relations between the variables and the composite canonical variates.[2]

First we check the canonical correlation for significance. That correlation (.90) is exceptionally large--.30 is generally accepted as the cut-off point for significant canonical correlations (Cooley and Lohnes, 1971, p. 176); and the chi-square test indicates the root departs significantly from zero.

For the within set interpretation (the between set interpretation is

deferred until the redundancy index is computed), we note that Set One variables are high, with the exception of the fourth variable which has a loading of .11. This suggests that variable 4 is unrelated to the dimension defined by the variables in Set One. It is possible to define the structure of Set One variables, but this concept is beyond the scope of this paper.

$R_c = .90$ $R_c^2 = .81$ $x^2 = p < .0001$

SET ONE (T-GROUP)			SET TWO (FAMILY)		
DV1	Here-and-Now	.91	DV1	Here-and-Now	.88
DV2	Feedback	.88	DV2	Feedback	.06
DV3	Empathy	-.78	DV3	Empathy	.92
DV4	Defensive	.11	DV4	Defensive	.07
DV5	Dignity	-.89	DV5	Dignity	-.97

In Set Two, only three of the five variables figure prominently into the analysis. Variables 2 and 4 are weighted very lightly and are eliminated from further consideration. We then concentrate our attention on the relationship of variables 1, 2, 3, and 5 in Set One and variables 1, 3 and 5 in Set Two.

To interpret the between set relationship, we must first compute the redundancy index ($\overline{R}$) (Stewart and Love, 1968). The redundancy index is computed for each variable set by using the following formula:

$$\overline{R} = \frac{\Sigma(R_{cc})^2 \times R_c^2}{M}$$

where $\Sigma(R_{cc})^2$ is the sum of the individual canonical components squared and M is the number of variables in the set. The quotient is then multiplied by the canonical correlation squared (R_c^2). The resulting product yields the redundancy index for the variable set. Therefore, for Set One of the example:

$$\overline{R} = \frac{(.91)^2 + (.88)^2 + (-.78)^2 + (.11)^2 + (-.89)^2}{5}$$

$$= .6032 \times .81$$

$$= .4884 \text{ or } 48.84 \text{ per cent}$$

The redundancy index indicates that 48.84 per cent of Set One's variance is redundant with and can be explained by the Set Two variables. Using the same formula for the Set Two variables, the redundancy is found to be 41.63 per cent.

A further value is found in the computation of the redundancy index. The

square of the canonical component loading is the variance extracted by the variable, and the sum of these values is the variance extracted by the variable set (60.32 per cent). The sum of the variance for all roots of the smaller of the two sets in a canonical correlation will always be 100 per cent. That is, the larger variable set always extracts 100 per cent of the variance from the smaller variable set. In the case of equal variable sets, each set will account for 100 per cent of the other set's variance.

Since both redundancy indices for the first root of our example are very large, it is concluded that the variable sets can be interpreted in either direction. That is, this first root can be interpreted as Set One given Set Two, or Set Two given Set One. This two-way interpretation does not always occur in canonical correlational analyses.

The development of the redundancy index has made interpretation of canonical correlation less complicated than was previously the case. One characteristic of canonical correlation is that one variable may create a significant canonical correlation. The redundancy index will indicate if this is the case; and although a significant canonical correlation may be obtained, the index may prove very low and will alter the final interpretation of the data.

The redundancy index is only a summary index and not an analytical tool. There are no redundancy tables such as the tables for chi-square tests or F tests. Therefore, a significant canonical correlation with a low redundancy index should not be totally discarded, but should be interpreted with less emphasis. The index is a method to simplify canonical correlation results, and should not be viewed as the final criterion for significance.

Since the redundancy index in our analysis indicated interpretation in both directions, we can now concentrate our attention to the between-set relationships. Variables 1, 2, 3 and 5 in Set One in relation to variables 1, 3 and 5 in Set Two and vice versa.

Turning to the first variable in Set One, the large positive loading of .91 indicates that there exists a strong relationship between that variable and the variables in Set Two. A strong positive loading in the T-group for staying with the "here-and-now" is associated with:

A strong positive loading for here-and-now communication in the family (DV1).

A strong positive loading on the empathy dimension in the family (DV3).

A strong negative loading on preserving human dignity in the family (DV5).

Since the second and fifth variables in Set One have essentially the same loadings as variable one, the interpretations are similar.

Variable 3 of Set One is interesting in view of its high negative loading of -.78. This is the "empathy" variable and is interpreted as follows. A negative loading in the T-group for empathy is associated with:

A strong positive loading for here-and-now in the family (DV1).

A strong positive loading on empathy in the family (DV3).

A strong negative loading on preserving human dignity in the family (DV5).

We may interpret the significant component loadings on either side and relate them to the opposite side in any way we wish. The rules for interpretation are straight forward:

1. Very low loadings, i.e. those approaching zero, indicate that the variable has no relationship to any of the variables within the set, or if the redundancy index is large enough, between those of the second set.

2. Interpretation of between-set relationships is indicated by the size

of the redundancy index. If the index is greater than 5 per cent, it can be assumed that the relationship extracted a significant amount of redundant variance to warrant further interpretation. Redundancy indices below 5 per cent do not indicate that the canonical root (if significant) should be discarded, only that it should be interpreted for heuristic value and should be given less emphasis in the interpretation.

3. Positive loadings indicate that high ratings on that variable are associated with either high or low ratings on another variable and the interpretation of the relationship depends on whether the other variables have a positive or negative loading.

4. As with any correlational analysis, the magnitude of the loadings is crucial. That is, some loadings might be properly labelled high if they are above .80, moderate if in the .40 to .79 bracket, low in the .30 to .40 range, and essentially zero below .30. These loading categorizations will change depending on the type of analysis conducted and the relative magnitude of the loadings throughout the study. That is, in a carefully designed study with a large sample, a loading in the mid to high 20's may be significant if there are no high loadings in the analysis.

One of the interesting features of a canonical correlation is that it extracts more than one root. In fact, it extracts as many roots as there are variables in the smaller set. So far we have concentrated on the first and largest root. The existence of a second significant root would permit us to make a second analysis. The canonical correlation, component loadings and all other information in the second root would be different from that of the first since the second root is the canonical correlation on the variance unaccounted for by the first root. For several reasons, we prefer not to discuss the interpretation of second or third significant roots.

In this hypothetical research example we have learned something about the effect of T-group behavior on the individual in the back-home family situation. And perhaps the contrived loadings may turn out not to be as far-fetched as we might think. Our "findings" suggest that T-groups may indeed have some impact on the individual in his home-life situation (and vice versa)--and this, we assume, is one of the primary motivations for a person enrolling in such a group.

In brief: thousands of people enroll in T-groups, encounter groups and awareness groups of many kinds every year. Most of the research has been of an internal nature. That is, it has concentrated on processess within the group itself. To date no systematic, basic level research has been carried out in an attempt to determine whether in fact the encounter group has any value beyond its own borders. Multivariate procedures are now widely available and there is no longer any reason why researchers cannot begin to determine the relationships existing, if any, between behavior in the encounter group and behavior back home. This kind of basic research is sorely needed if we are ever to have a rational response to the question "encounter groups--so what?"

Reference Notes

1. Hotelling, H. The most predictable criterion. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1935, 26, 139-142. See also, Hotelling, H. Relations between two sets of variables. Biometrika, 1936, 28, 321-377; Weiss, D.J. Canonical correlation analysis in counselling psychology research. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1972, 17, 241-252.
2. Beta weights have historically been utilized for interpretation. However, current practice is to interpret the canonical components. See Thorndike, R.M. and Weiss, D.J. A study of the stability of canonical correlations and canonical components. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1973, 33, 123-134.
3. The generally accepted cut-off point that indicates if the canonical correlation warrants further analysis is 5 per cent. However, there is no strict rule or for that matter, any formal statement relating to this rule.

References

Cooley, W.W. and Lohnes, P.R. Multivariate Data Analysis. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Hotelling, H. The most predictable criterion. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1935, 26, 139-142.

Stewart, D. and Love, W. A general canonical correlation index. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 160-163.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS IN THE APPLICATION OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION IN THE GROUP SETTING: A RESPONSE

William C. Donaghy

University of Wyoming

Bobby Patton's paper is a well written, scholarly piece of work. My major response throughout this presentation, however, will be that he fails to raise what I consider to be the most critical question regarding the application of growth-promoting communication in the group setting. For me the critical question is: Which group setting holds the most promise for creating growth-promoting communication? Like Ray Tucker, I am concerned about the "back home" application of growth promoted in the human potential movement, and its relationship to "the real world." I am not convinced by Dr. Patton's disclaimer (i.e., "This limitation in the focus of my paper is not intended to deny the growth-potential within task-oriented groups.") or the justification presented for limiting the paper so narrowly (i.e., "The T-group, however, is unique in that its basis for existence is to permit growth-producing communication.") I believe that such a limited approach does in fact represent many communication scholar's attitudes towards methods of promoting growth in the group setting. Before I endeavor to present an alternative answer to the critical question as I presented it above, I would like to respond to a few of the other portions of the Patton paper which I feel deserve further comment.

Dr. Patton starts out with what he calls a "rather negative prologue," citing "atrocities and horror stories" and the comparison which is sometimes made between sensitivity training and brainwashing. This negative position is taken quite regularly by persons within our own discipline of communication as well as within other disciplines where human relations training is practiced. I have read training casualty figures which range as high as 18 percent (Treloar, 1971) and have heard unconfirmed figures which go as high as 25 percent. The most often cited reasons for casualties is the presence of untrained leaders and emotionally unstable participants.

> People with nothing more than a talent for listening with a sympathetic ear or being able to trigger emotional response from other people, began organizing encounter groups of their own.
>
> For the most part, they deny being therapists and so have escaped state laws....
>
> And the type of leader most apt to cause psychological damage to a group member (is) the most charismatic of the leaders...authoritarian...who focuses upon the individual rather than the group.

> Some people become leaders to satisfy unhealthy needs... the people most apt to be hurt in an encounter group is the one with very high hopes that it will magically change his life. [Treloar, 1971].

These questions regarding the possible negative consequences of sensitivity training are certainly not new. In an NTL Institute publication titled "Commonly Asked Questions About Sensitivity Training and NTL Institute," (1969) the following questions and answers appear:

(6) What is the difference between sensitivity training and group therapy? Sensitivity training is not intended or practiced as a means for correcting significant psychological deficiencies, and persons needing or seeking psychotherapy are discouraged from participating.

(7) Do some participants become mentally disturbed during sensitivity training? The incidence of serious stress and mental disturbance during training is difficult to measure. NTL Institute records suggest that fewer than one percent of participants have had significant problems during training under NTL Institute auspices. In almost all cases they have been persons with a history of prior serious disturbances.

(10) Is sensitivity training related to brainwashing? Does it teach manipulation of others? Sensitivity training is an exact opposite of brainwashing. Sensitivity training aims to provide the knowledge, skills, and sensitivities to support individual differences. It arms the individual against group pressure and teaches individuals to build groups that respect and support individual differences. It promotes the value of free and open collaboration.

(20) What are the qualifications of a trainer? A trainer must have a thorough understanding of group and individual behavior, and skill in using training technology. He must be in touch with his own feelings, of capably dealing with others in open and nonpunitive fashion, and able to recognize symptoms of severe psychological stress.

(21) Is there such a thing as an accredited trainer? No. However, trainers employed by NTL Institute are either elected Fellows or Associates of the Institute or they meet the standards for election as Associates. Those standards include extensive theoretical background in personal, interpersonal, small-group, and organizational dynamics; a high level of interpersonal competence; and supervised training experience with a wide variety of groups and organizations. The qualifications of NTL Institute trainers typically include advanced graduate training in one of the behavioral sciences.

There is no doubt that problems and casualties do occur in growth promoting, group training programs as they do in any mental and physical growth program (i.e., home, school, business, civic, youth and many other groups). This does not mean, however, that we should abandon growth promoting activities either in the laboratory or in the field simply because accidents can and sometimes do occur. We don't ban the practice of medicine because mistakes occur or some practitioners are unqualified. We don't ban politics because some vice-presidents take bribes. We work to prevent problems from occuring, but we don't brand all with the sins of a few. In this respect, Dr. Patton and I are in complete agreement.

I can recognize very little difference in theory between "the 'tricky' approach" like nude encounters or "clitoris-raising groups" (Wolfe, 1974) and T-grouping or sensitivity training as proposed by Dr. Patton. They are all conducted within a "miniature society" outside the usual social and working relationships of the participants. They all rely upon self-generated data which may or may not have any relationship to the participants circumstances outside the group. No matter how hard I try I cannot draw the distinction Dr. Patton suggests other than the fact that for one approach participants have their clothes on and for the other they do not.

The final point I would like to make is one that is passed over very briefly in Bobby's paper; it involves the much discussed "re-entry problem" in the human potential movement. The problem is best described by Jane Howard in her book PLEASE TOUCH (1970) which grew out of a year of examining growth promoting groups.

> Just as it is hard to be sober when nobody else is, I found what thousands of other veterans of groups have found: that it is hard to re-enter 'back-home' reality after the intoxicating communion of a successful encounter or T-group. "Real people," with their buttoned jackets, folded newspapers and legitimate worries about purse snatchers and rent control, are seldom prepared for all that exaggerated candor and high-voltage warmth. So much spontaneity threatens them [p. 239].

Further description of the same problem appears in TIME magazine (1970):

> Sometimes recognition that the world has not changed is more than the returning grouper's new sensory awareness can take...in which case he either turns into a "T-group bum," endlessly circuiting the growth centers, or into a cop-out. An alarming number of such refugees from reality leave their wives, families, jobs and communities [p. 58].

It is even suggested by Kenneth D. Benne in the book T-GROUP THEORY AND LABORATORY METHOD (1964) that sensitivity trainers have "sloughed off this responsibility" and do not help the participants "plan for the transfer of laboratory learnings to their home settings" [p. 100].

Along with Dr. Tucker, I consider the re-entry problem to be a crucial one in the human potential movement. I believe that persons involved either as leaders or as participants must be made fully aware, ahead of time, of the values limitations of their training program. In his article, "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Laboratory Training in Industry", Paul C. Buchanan (1965) points out that human relations training programs are of two basic types: those whose primary emphasis is on self-insight and whose effects are mostly personal and relatively short term (because of the re-entry problem), and those whose goals include helping the participant mature and "act effectively and with satisfaction in concert with others" in an intact organization and whose effects are interpersonal and, I believe, more long lasting (because re-entry is no

longer a major problem). If potential group leaders and participants are made fully aware of the types of training programs available to them, I think both would be much more satisfied with the results. This does not mean that both types of groups might not share many of the same goals in common, but that the differences are significant enough to merit separate groupings. Some of those differences are (1) the nature of and relationships between the participants, (2) the skills and background necessary for the leader, (3) the type of setting in which the training program takes place, (4) the uniqueness of the content, and (5) the nature and carry-over of the learning desired. In discussing "process consulting", which I consider to be one type of non-laboratory human relations training program, Edgar H. Schein (1969) outlines what he sees as the differences in the following manner:

> The process consultant often operates in industry in much the same way a general practitioner does in medicine; he is, in a sense, an organizational internist. The analogy holds if one thinks of the consultant as helping the organization to arrive at a diagnosis before deciding on some specialized treatment. The analogy breaks down, however, if one considers that the internist is the prime expert in the diagnosis. He runs tests, asks questions, pokes about, and then delivers a diagnosis and advice. The process consultant, in contrast, attempts to involve the organization in self-diagnosis and enables the organization to give itself sound advice.
>
> A better analogy is to think of the process consultant as a sociotherapist or as a T-group trainer, for a system which varies in size and composition from time to time. The concepts of 'diagnosis' and 'helpful intervention' derive directly from the concept of laboratory training. The major difference between helping a group and consulting for an organization lies in the complexity of the task. To be an effective process consultant, the person needs diagnostic and intervention skills which are quite different from those used in a human relations training group. The process consultant does not have the environmental supports of a laboratory; he cannot even assume a commitment to learning comparable to that of the lab participant. Through his own interventions, from an ambiguous power base, and in the midst of on-going work, he must build involvement and commitment, and must gain acceptance for the importance of looking at process / pp. 133-4 /.

I do not have the time nor do I think this is the appropriate place to go into elaborate detail on the ways one should or should not produce growth promoting behavior in intact groups. As in all human relations training programs there are definite problems that can and do arise and pitfalls for which the trained leader must watch. I am convinced, however, that in terms of the promoting interpersonal and long term growth the intact rather than laboratory training programs are generally more successful. In most growth promoting communication programs with

intact groups, all of the seven underlying assumptions suggested by Dr. Patton in his paper are maintained. In the same vein, the "eight behaviors for the trainer or any facilitative person in a group" are also maintained in most intact group training situations. One of the best examples I have found to illustrate what an intact growth group is like is presented by Chris Argyris in an article for LIFE magazine entitled "We Must Make Work Worthwhile" (1967). The group members were the president and nine vice-presidents of a large industrial organization who went on retreat for a week to discuss their problems:

> At the outset, after defining the objectives of this educational experience, the seminar leader said, in effect, "O.K. Let's go," There was a very loud silence and someone said "What do you want us to do?"
>
> (Silence)
>
> "Where's the agenda?"
>
> (Silence)
>
> "Look, here, what's going on? Aren't you going to lead this?"
>
> (Silence)
>
> "I didn't come up here to feel my stomach move. What's up?"
>
> (Silence)
>
> "Fellows, if he doesn't speak in five minutes, I'm getting out of here."
>
> "Gentlemen," said the treasurer, "We've paid for the day, so let's remain at least till five."
>
> "You know, there's something funny going on here."
>
> "What's funny about it?"
>
> "Well, up until a few minutes ago we trusted this man enough that all of us were willing to leave the company for a week. Now we dislike him. Why? He hasn't done anything?"
>
> "That's right. And it's his job to do something. He's the leader and he ought to lead."
>
> "But I'm learning something already about how we react under these conditions. I honestly feel uncomfortable and somewhat fearful. Does anybody else?"
>
> "That's interesting that you mention fear, because I think that we run the company by fear."
>
> The president turned slightly red and became annoyed. "I don't think that we run this company by fear and I don't think you should have said that."
>
> A loud silence followed. The vice-president thought for a moment, took a breath, looked the president straight in the eye and said, "I still think we run this company by fear and I agree with you. I should not have said it."
>
> The group laughed and the tension was broken.
>
> "I'm sorry," the president said. "I wanted all you fellows with me here so that we can try to develop a higher sense of openness and trust. The first one that really levels with us, I let him have it. I'm sorry--but it isn't easy to hear about management by fear..."

"And it's not easy to tell you."

"Why not? Haven't I told you that my door is open?"

And the group plunged into the issue of how they judge the openness of a person--by the way he speaks or by the way he behaves?

The group explored their views about each other thoroughly--the way each individual tended unintentionally to inhibit the other (the vice-president learned that they inhibited each other as much as the president did, but for years had felt it was his fault); their levels of aspiration, their goals in their company life and in their total life; their ways of getting around each other, ranging from not being honest with one another to creating organizational fires which had to be put out by someone else; their skill at polarizing issues when deep disagreements occurred so that the decisions could be bucked right up to the president, who would have to take the responsibility and the blame; their techniques in the game of one-upmanship, etc. [p. 66].

According to Argyris when the members of this group got back home they were able to reduce the number and amount of time spent in meetings, defensive politicing, and windmilling at all levels. They found improvements in delegation of responsibility, information flow and decision making.

I am reminded at this point of some impressive comments presented at a theory session of the National Training Laboratory by Bill Dyer (from private notes). He said that the prime condition for learning and growth in a group is the atmosphere or climate. According to Dyer the two main variables effecting a group's climate are trust and power. It seems to me that the matter of trust can be explored in both intact and laboratory groups, perhaps slightly better in the laboratory group. However, the ramifications of the power dimension on a group's climate can in no way be as realistically examined in the laboratory as in the field where a natural power structure exists. It seems to me that the illustration presented above is a classic example of this advantage in a natural, not artificial or "miniature" group society.

The comments I have made in this last section have focused pretty much on industrial and business groups, because my main area of interest, and therefore, my references are mainly from the organizational communication perspective. I do feel quite confident, however, that similar programs have been tried and have been successful in other natural settings, such as political, social, educational, civic, youth, and family groups. In these, as in business groups, I am sure that the interpersonal growth which takes place is at least as, and probably more, lasting than that which would have been gained if the participants had been grouped in a "laboratory" manner. I do not have proof for this statement in quantitative terms; as yet these are merely my personal observations. I hope someday that as much time and effort will be devoted to studying intact-group human relations training programs as has already been spent studying and conducting such programs in laboratories. When that is done I believe my observations will be proven empirically.

In conclusion, I would like to state once more that my response to Dr. Patton's paper is highly positive. I think that where we do disagree, we disagree in approach only and not in our goal of promoting healthy human relationships through communication in the group setting. Perhaps Morton A. Lieberman, Irvin D. Yalom, and Matthew B. Miles (1973) summed up the problems and potentialities of the movement for both intact and laboratory groups when they said:

> "If we no longer expect groups to produce magical, lasting change and if we stop seeing them as panaceas, we can regard them as useful, socially sanctioned opportunities for human beings to explore and express themselves. Then we can begin to work on ways to improve them so that they make a meaningful contribution toward solving human problems [p. 76]."

References

Argyris, C. We must make work worthwhile. Life, 1967, 62 (18).

Bradford, L. P., Gibb, J. R. and Benne, K. D. (Eds.) T-group theory and laboratory method. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Buchanan, P. C. Evaluating the effectiveness of laboratory training in industry. In Explorations in Human Relations Training and Research. (No. 1) Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories, 1965.

Commonly asked questions about sensitivity training and NTL institute. NTL Institute, 1969, 3.

Howard, J. Please touch: A guided tour of the human potential movement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Koffend, J. Human potential: The revolution in feeling. Time, 1970, 96 (19).

Lieberman, M., Yalom, I., and Miles, M. Encounter: The leader makes the difference. Psychology Today, 1973.

Schein, E. Process consultation: Its role in organizational development. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Treloar, J. Encounter groups: Too much raw honesty. The Detroit Sunday News, August 1, 1971.

Wolfe, L. Take two aspirins and masturbate. Playboy, 1974, 21 (6).

PRESENT STATE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS OF GROWTH-PROMOTING BEHAVIOR IN PERSONAL CRISIS SETTINGS

Recently, behavioral scientists have applied their energies to situations in which people are experiencing a personal crisis. Marital crises, drug problems, alcoholism and suicide are just a few of the personal crises currently being approached through communication. Because of the pragmatic importance of these situations this section of papers focuses on the personal crisis as it relates to communication. The major position paper is by William Arnold, Arizona State University. The responses to his paper are by William Brooks, Purdue University and Hugh McGinley, University of Wyoming.

CRISIS COMMUNICATION AND GROWTH-PROMOTING BEHAVIOR

William E. Arnold
Arizona State University

We had joy, we had fun, we had seasons in the sun
But the wine and the songs like the seasons have all gone.

Goodbye, Michelle, my little one,
You gave me love and helped me find the sun
And everytime that I was down,
You would always come around and get my feet back on the ground.

Goodbye, Michelle, it's hard to die
When all the birds are singing in the sky
Now that the spring is in the air, with flowers everywhere

We had joy, we had fun, we had seasons in the sun
But the stars we could reach were just starfish on the beach.*

Was the subject of the song really planning to commit suicide? If we accept the song as a true desire to die, is the singer portraying a cry for help? What are the odds that he would be successful in committing suicide? Whether he intended to commit suicide or not, 83% of those who commit suicide have communicated such an intent within a year before the successful suicide. Suicide is viewed in this paper as the antithesis of growth promoting behavior. Suicide is the result of a failure to resolve some form of crisis.

Another example of a crisis was presented by Carkhuff (1969):

> It's not an easy thing to talk about. I guess the heart of the problem is sort of a sexual problem. I never thought I would have this sort of problem. But I find myself not getting the fulfillment I used to. It's not as enjoyable for my husband either, although we don't discuss it. I used to enjoy and look forward to making love. I used to have an orgasm but I don't anymore. I can't remember the last time I was satisfied. I find myself being attracted to other men and wondering what it would be like to go to bed with them. I don't know what this means. Is this symptomatic of our whole relationship as a marriage? Is something wrong with us? (p. 117)

Unlike the songwriter who planned to commit suicide, this woman decided that she faced a crisis and sought help of one trained in crisis intervention. More than one individual can face a similar

---

* Terry Jacks

crisis at a given moment. When tornadoes hit, many individuals including whole cities face singularly and collectively the same crisis.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationships of crisis, communication, and growth promoting behavior. While these concepts have been cross-referenced in the literature, they have not been explored for their commonality. This paper focuses on these interrelationships. To develop the commonality an exploration of the literature of crisis and crisis intervention is included.

While there is no agreement on the definition of a crisis, several versions emerge which have elements essential to the discussion. While the focus of each of these definitions is comparable, the emphasis is on a different stage of the crisis process. Caplan (1964) suggested that a crisis can be characterized as an emotional reaction to an external hazardous situation, with the possibility of ensuing disorganization of behavior. The emphasis in this definition is placed upon the external situation which creates the crisis. In a systems theory approach to crisis, this definition would be labelled a part of the input phase. Fink (1967) presented a process definition for crisis. He stated that a human system (individual, group, organization, or other) is assumed to be in a state of crisis when its repertoire of coping responses is not adequate to bring about a resolution of a problem which poses a threat to the system. He tied the definition into the input phase by suggesting that a crisis is precipitated by an indentifiable event either within or outside the system. Putting these together, crisis can be viewed as a hazard or threat which affects the problem-solving ability of the individual to resolve the issue in a normal manner. Erikson (1968) provided the output phase of our systems model analogy to crisis. He defined a crisis as a necessary turning point, a crucial moment, when development must move one way or another marshalling resources of growth and recovery and further differentiation. Thus, he was looking from a processing phase toward some output or final resolution of the crisis. Resolution could result in growth-promoting behavior. While more will be made of this point later in the paper, it is essential to emphasize the need for research on the nature of crisis, crisis formation, and the efficacy of communication as a process to facilitate crisis resolution and abatement.

As suggested above, a viable hope for growth-promoting behavior in an individual is through the development of ways of dealing with the problem through new resources and strengths within oneself and one's environment. When the individual has the capability either through one's own volition or with the help of a crisis interventionist to deal with the crisis and its ramifications, growth-promoting behavior has begun. Carkhuff (1969) extended this definition to a conclusion by suggesting that all processes that occur at crisis points in an individual's life can be deteriorative or growth-promoting by definition. Using our ethical standards, we would probably suggest that the song writer in the introduction has decided on a behavior which would lead to death as the resolution of problems rather than through what we might perceive to be growth-promoting behavior. Suicide viewed in Carkhuff's terms, must be a deteriorative process.

Since these definitions explore the nature of crisis from a limited perspective, a more encompassing definition is needed. Crisis is defined as a decision-making point when an individual, group, organization, state, or nation is unable to cope without some form of assistance. When an organization is unable to cope with an important business decision,

this would be defined as a crisis. Watergate would be viewed as a national crisis; the Mideast situation could be seen as an international crisis. Each crisis leaves the respective agent unable to cope with a problem. This definition takes a process perspective in that the input is represented by all of the issues surrounding the event; the output-the ultimate decision; and the process phase--the steps necessary for resolution. While it would be possible for the person or agency in crisis to resolve the respective crisis, some help is usually necessary. As with all of the other definitions of crisis, communication is seen as an essential part of the process. Without communication, resolution would be impossible.

The primary assumption used by this writer was that communication is an essential precursor of growth-promoting behavior. The assumption is also made that communication can serve as an adaptive process to deal with crisis situations. This latter assumption was based on Fink's definition of crisis - a condition of an individual who is incapable of using his coping or adaptive responses to bring about resolution. Individuals who have faced a crisis and have resolved it have adapted to their environment. Communication must be seen as an integral part of this adaptive process. Brockopp and Hoff (1972) described a case which demonstrated the adaptive role of communication:

> A girl called the crisis center upon the advice of her mother as she could not stop crying one morning following a suicide attempt with her mother's pills. Intake interview revealed a very depressed, anxious and desperate girl with a history of family conflict, drug involvement and a prior suicide attempt. After separate sessions with the girl and her divorced mother, family therapy was initiated with a total of six sessions including one with an older friend who allegedly initiated the girl into the drug scene. The focus in family crisis therapy was on the meaning of the girl's suicidal and drug behavior in relation to total family problems. By the end of the sessions there was evidence of marked improvement in communication between mother and daughter, relief of depression, crying and suicidal ideation of attempts. (p. 5)

Communication helped in the solution and was also the product of the crisis intervention.

Another assumption which served as a basis for this paper was that communication research on existing variables can help find answers to questions in a crisis and in crisis intervention. While it would be desirable to do research in the area of crisis intervention, it is not always possible to deal with individuals facing the crisis state. As a result, one must either deal with simulation exercises and their outcome, or apply the research of traditional communication to the crisis setting. Although further research must be encouraged in crisis, all current communication research must be examined for its relevance to crisis intervention work. For example, the research in credibility can have a great deal of application to the role of a crisis interventionist. Brockopp (1972) suggested that crisis centers must find individuals who are competent, able to respond to people in a positive

way, are understanding, and can detect problems from the verbal and nonverbal cues. The last criterion suggests someone trained in communication. The literature of credibility including the many scales developed to measure credibility could be useful both for the selection of volunteers and for their evaluation.

The final assumption that this writer made in examination of the crisis literature was that an individual who is in a crisis state seeks homeostasis through the resolution of his problem. Emmert and Arnold (in press) suggested that one of the basic needs of all individuals is to maintain consistency. Certainly a crisis can be viewed as a situation which arouses inconsistency or, in traditional terms, imbalance. The resolution of a crisis results in an equilibrium or a return to consistency.

Limitations

While it may be considered a disclaimer, several obvious limitations must be suggested at this time. Given the limitation of time and resources, this paper could not possibly be inclusive of all the areas of crisis or in all models of intervention. As a result, the paper will attempt to deal with some of the more basic issues of crisis and some of the more basic skills to ameliorate the crisis state. Readers are invited to turn to Cowen (1973) and Back (1974) for a more thorough review of the literature in the psychological area of social and community intervention and specific intervention techniques. These writers have annotated the current literature in the area of crisis intervention. One source which describes crisis intervention and intervention training is Carkhuff (1969).

The final limitation of this paper must be in the scope to which any given crisis is examined. For example, the development of an interpersonal crisis can result in numerous levels and areas in which the person is affected. Only the areas of suicide and organizational crisis are dealt with in any depth. The Watergate crisis would have been an interesting case for exploration in this paper, but we need a perspective that only time can provide.

Categories of crises

To understand the role of communication as an adaptive process in crisis, the different types of crises are delineated. Writers in the field have attempted to differentiate types of crises from numerous perspectives. This paper will examine the category systems of Caplan (1964), Hill (1958), Eliot (1949), and Ruesch (1961).

Caplan (1964) was able to develop two broad categories of crises which he felt explained most circumstances. The first group included those crises which were a result of changes in the everyday environment. These included such things as attending school for the first time, the birth of a sibling, the emergence of heterosexual interests, marriage, retirement, death, and divorce. These events were perceived as commonly occurring or expected in most everyday living. They could also be viewed as crises that would affect an individual and, to a limited extent, groups of individuals. While many individuals might feel grief associated with death, each grieving person would face the crisis individually. The second category included crises which were a result of unusual events, such as chronic illness, accidents, or family dislocations. These crises could be viewed as unexpected. These crises, while most often affecting an individual, could also affect the members of the

immediate or extended family. However, Caplan's system must be viewed as limited in that it dealt primarily with the individual crisis, rather than the broad crisis which could affect an organization, group or state.

Hill (1958), like Caplan, saw crises basically in two categories. He placed greater emphasis on the family as the focus of crisis. His first category included those crises precipitated by extra-familial events. These events included war, floods, economic depression, and other forms of natural disaster. Hill's second category of crises were those precipitated by intra-familial events or circumstances. Hill's second category then, would include most of the crises elaborated by Caplan. Hill felt the intrafamilial situation such as desertion, alcoholism, and infidelity could result typically in the demoralization of a family, whereas extra-familial crises would tend to solidify the family. Although Hill's category system broadened the basis for crises to include a group, or in his system, a family, his perspective was limited as Caplan's in that he did not include a societal based categorical system for crises.

While Hill's system broadened the base for a delineation of crises, Eliot (1949) provided an in-depth consideration of the intrafamilial circumstances. Eliot labelled the first of these circumstances dismemberment which would include the loss of a family member either through death or extended separation because of war, imprisonment, economic dislocation, or hospitalization. He labelled the second category crises of ascension which included unplanned additions to the family. These would range from unwanted pregnancies to the unwanted addition of a step child or step parent. In the third category of crises, demoralization, the family was faced with an undesirable event which affects one or more members. These would include nonsupport by a divorced spouse, infidelity, alcoholism, unemployment, and mental disorders. These, of course, were quite similar to the situations described in Hill's category of crises. In his final category, Eliot lumped all crises that would be a combination of the three. Thus, it was possible to have demoralization accompanied by dismemberment or association. Typical examples of these would include a runaway adolescent, a suicide, or a homicide. Like Caplan, Eliot did not provide a category system which would include all types of crises. While he should not be faulted for this omission, a broad based definition is needed for our discussion.

Following the systems model analogy provided earlier in this paper, Ruesch (1961) suggested that crises can be explored from an individual or group viewpoint and that these crises can occur at different stages in the systems model. He suggested several crises which would occur at the input stage when an individual might be overstimulated with a rapid bombardment without pause or with intense stimulation which exceeds the tolerance or limits of the individual. Scott and Lashbrook (1974) suggested that one of the major problems facing the communication field was to deal with this very condition. Together (1970) they coined the phrase, future shock, to describe this condition. Society now faces a time of information overload so that we are no longer able to cope. This point was not new and was suggested in the original Shannon and Weaver discussion of information theory (1949).

A second example of an input crisis would be the opposite of information overload. Understimulation could be a crisis which would include voluntary or forced sensory deprivation. Buley (1973) looked at the

effects of the combination sensory deprivation and/or information overload on the communicative network of an individual. These input crises as described by Ruesch are central to the study of communication. We have yet to scratch the surface of the effects of sensory deprivation and information overload as it relates to the whole system of communication. Toffler (1970) also discussed this crisis when he stated that when we combine the effects of decisional stress with sensory and cognitive overload, we produce severe common forms of individual maladaptation.

Ruesch's second level of individual crisis was labelled anticipation or recollection. These included circumstances where statements were shown to be at variance with actual events or when the anticipation of a future state is no longer possible and the individual faces depression. The inability of an individual to predict future events typified the crisis that Ruesch was talking about at the second level.

Within the processing stage, Ruesch labelled his crisis as decision-making. When decisions did not solve the problem or when the circumstances changed so rapidly that decision often came too late, a crisis often occurred. We have all faced such decision-making crises when we had to select among numerous job opportunities, each with a different time for decision (at least during the prosperous years of the 60's). Soldiers are faced with these forms of crisis in every battle. As soon as a decision is reached, new information arrives and forces a new decision. Kissinger's hopping from Mideast capital to Mideast capital could result in such a crisis if one nation changes its mind while he is talking to the other. All research on decision-making and problem-solving methods is relevant to this level of crisis.

Output was Ruesch's final level of individual crisis. A convention-goer, because he engaged in over activity with insufficient rest and/or sleep deprivation, would suffer this type of crisis. In all cases, Ruesch was suggesting a crisis which affects an individual when faced with quantitative alterations in a relationship with one's surroundings. It must be underscored that most of these crises resulted from some kind of communication activity, be it an incomplete process or a quantitative deviation in communication itself.

In examining crises which affect a group, Ruesch suggested that these occurred either when communication within a group was disturbed or when communication with other groups was disturbed. While he did not explore these from a systems theory analogy, they seemed to be amenable to categorization at three levels. One level concerned the nature of the group in its composition, relationship, organization, or value system. A second level concerned the messages which flow within and between the groups. The third level concerned the contact of the group either with disturbed individuals, or with catastrophic situations occurring from such things as hurricanes and earthquakes. Later we will explore the role of communication in the reduction of crises. Thus far communication has been viewed by Ruesch as a major part of the process which disturbs groups causing them to face a crisis.

To overcome the shortcomings of the previously suggested categorical systems for crises, a broad model was developed for the elaboration of crises as well as the suggested types of intervention for dealing with the crises. (See Figure 1) Close examination of this model shows that it parallels our communication paradigm. Rather than viewing some psychological and physiological crises as interpersonal, they were viewed as intrapersonal or crises of the individual. No attempt was made to provide a complete

Figure I

CRISIS	INTERVENTION
INTRAPERSONAL	
Psychological	
Anxiety Stress	Telephone Service Therapy
Physical	
Suicide Drugs Medical	Therapy Drug Rescue
INTERPERSONAL	
Dating	Telephone Service
Marriage	Counseling
Divorce	Psychotherapy
Family Dysfunction	
GROUP	
Protest	Arbitration
Strikes	Negotiation
ORGANIZATION	
Declining Market	Counseling
Bankruptcy	Legislation
COMMUNITY	
Disaster	Community Relief Community Mental Health Programs
SOCIETY	
War	United Nations Negotiation

delineation of all crises affecting us on an intrapersonal, interpersonal, group or organization, community, or societal level. Likewise, the intervention systems were also not completely delineated. This model provides a framework for further elaboration and discussion.

Stages of Crises

Both Pasework and Albers (1972) and Fink (1967) have developed models for exploring the stages of an individual crisis. Their models were quite similar. However, the Fink model differentiated the experience in an individual while passing through the stages of an individual crisis. Figure 2 presents the psychological phases of crisis as an individual faces them. Fink postulated four sequential phases that the individual goes through in order to cope with the crisis situation in a constructive manner. These are: 1) shock, 2) defense retreat, 3) acknowledgement, 4) adaptation. Similarly, Pasework and Albers defined phase one as a period of disorganization when an individual would withdraw or experience heightened anxiety as a result of the crisis event. An advantage of the Fink model was that it described the effect of the four phases on different components of the individual, i.e., self-perception, perceptions of reality, emotional experiences, and on the cognitive structure of the situation. His last category of physical disability would apply only as a prototype for those circumstances when an individual was faced with a crisis of genetic disability, disabling injury, or a disease. Communication plays an important part of the development of self-perception, of our perceptions of reality around us, and how we emotionally or cognitively respond to a circumstance.

Gottschalk and Gleser (1969) developed a measuring instrument for the transcient emotional motivational and cognitive states. This approach uses lexical aspects of verbal communication rather than vocal or paralanguage cues. Their scales, which have been tested on verbal behavior, are composed of items which measure anxiety, hostility, social alienation-personal disorganization, capacity for human relations, cognitive and intellectual impairment, hope, sickness-health. The implications of their measurement of psychological states through content analysis of verbal communication behavior have not been explored by the communication field or applied to crisis and crisis intervention.

In reviewing the stages of a crisis, Pasework and Albers (1972) drew two conclusions which seemed appropriate to communication's role in crisis resolution. First, an individual needs and may require assistance in surmounting the crisis. These persons can be members of the immediate family, friends, or social workers. Second, facilitating communication between the individual and these helper individuals mitigates the severity of the crisis. While both of these were conclusions drawn from literature, it would certainly be appropriate to test these in actual crisis situations. Particularly, studies should be conducted on the role of communication, in its facilitating dimension, as a reducer of crisis. The second conclusion of Pasework and Albers supports the earlier assumption that communication serves an adaptive role in the amelioration of crisis.

Intervention Strategies

For any intervention strategy to work, the individual experiencing the crisis must be aware that such intervention is available. Frequently, individuals in crisis have had no previous knowledge of, let alone contact with, organizations designed to provide intervention services. Hav-

Figure II

Psychologic Phases of Crisis

TIME	Phase	Self Experience	Reality Perceptions	Emotional Experience	Cognitive Structure	Physical Disability
	Shock (stress)	Threat to existing structures	Perceived as overwhelming	Panic; anxiety; helplessness	Disorganization; inability to plan or to reason or to understand situation	Acute somatic damage requiring full medical care
	Defensive retreat	Attempt to maintain old structures	Avoidance of reality; "wishful thinking"; denial, repression	Indifference or euphoria (except when challenged, in which case anger); (low anxiety)	Defensive reorganization; resistance to change	Physical recovery from acute phase; functional return to maximum possible level
	Acknowledgment (renewed stress)	Giving up existing structure; self depreciaction	Facing reality; facts "impose" themselves	Depression with apathy or agitation; bitterness; mourning; high anxiety; if overwhelming, suicide	Defensive breakdown: (1) disorganization; (2) reorganization in terms of altered reality perceptions	Physical plateau; gradual slowing of improvement until no change is experienced
	Adapation and change	Establishing new structure; sense of worth	New Reality testing	Gradual increase in satisfying experiences; (gradual lowering of anxiety)	Reorganization in terms of present resources and abilities	No change in physical disability status

ing developed a crisis center, this author is aware of the difficulties in establishing the center as a viable option for crisis intervention. Much research has been conducted on the community's awareness of new services for the purpose of crisis resolution. See, for example, the research of Gaullorakis (1971) Arnold (1972) and Arnold, Liddell, Findling (1974) for an elaboration of three studies designed to determine communication networks for an emerging crisis center.

The success of any intervention strategy rests on the credibility of the interventionist with the person in crisis. While many communication principles can be used to facilitate resolution of the crisis, basic trust and confidence of the interventionist is paramount in the crisis relationship (Brockopp, 1972). While the severity of the crisis would mitigate against the elaborate building of a therapist's credentials, some effort must be made either prior to or during the crisis interaction to establish the credibility of the interventionist. Rusk (1971) suggested that the golden rule for the helper in crisis intervention is to do for others that which they cannot do for themselves and no more. The helper provides a coping behavior for the helpee* so that the helpee might see the way out of the crisis and forward toward continued growth-promoting behavior.

Rusk (1971) suggested several skills or approaches to deal with the helper/helpee relationship. These are: 1) calm confidence, 2) hopefulness, 3) active leadership, 4) intrusiveness, and 5) explicit empathy. The first two, which represent attitudes of the helper, could be developed and tested through the communication analysis suggested by Gottschalk and Gleser. Besides reducing the anxiety of the individual in crisis, the outward manifestations of these attitudes should assist in establishing the credibility of the helper. Unlike forms of psychotherapy, active leadership suggests that the crisis situation is so unique that the helper must apply control and assist the helpee develop a specific coping behavior. The helper must assist the individual in focusing on the appropriate behavior to resolve the crisis. This would be the opposite of non-directive therapy. Rusk suggested that empathy, which is a key to the therapeutic relationship, can awaken feelings akin to the mother-child symbiosis. In fact, he would probably suggest that empathy is the basis for the establishment of what we would call high credibility. The helper who refuses to share the distress will find the patient reluctant to confront reality and will usually dismiss the helper as one who does not care about the individual or the crisis. The verbal behavior of the helper should be subjected to content analysis to determine the ability to empathize with the helpee.

Each of these skills suggested by Rusk was based upon communication as an adaptive behavior. Each, however, should be tested for its ability to not only resolve the crisis, but to establish a meaningful intervention relationship.

Carkhuff (1969) developed five scales to measure skills for the helping relationship. These skills included empathic understanding of interpersonal process, communication of respect in interpersonal processes, personally relevant concreteness or specificity of expression in interpersonal processes, facilitative genuineness in interpersonal processes and facilitative self-disclosure in interpersonal processes. Again, each of these represents a dimension of therapeutic communication as a means of dealing with an individual in crisis. Each of these skills was developed on five levels in order to determine the degree of ef-

*helpee--one who faces the crisis

fectiveness of the helper. These range from verbal and behavioral expressions of the helpee to level five where the helper's response adds significantly to the feelings and meanings of expressions of the helpee. Again, these skills must be elaborated and tested for their effectiveness in dealing with the crises that individual, group, or organizations face. Time does not permit an elaboration of Carkhuff's system for communication training to develop these skills in the helper. It is obvious that research is needed to determine the effectiveness of his skills in the crisis interaction.

These skills and strategies could be employed to serve four functions in the crisis intervention. First, the helper could provide an empathetic response to the person in crisis. While this would not be complete in itself, it is perhaps a sine qua non in crisis intervention. Second, the helper must provide an accurate reflection of ideas and feelings of the helpee. Such an objective demands skills in critical listening both for the verbal and the paralanguage of the helpee. Third, the interventionist must be able to provide information for the immediate resolution of the crisis. This demands of the helper not only communicator credibility, but competence to express a variety of behavioral options to the helpee. Fourth, a helper must be able to convince the helpee of the need for a plan of resolution and to put it into effect. Certainly all the literature in persuasion, attitude and behavioral change theory would be appropriate to develop this skill.

Rusk (1971) suggested some advantages which amortize the effectiveness of immediate crisis intervention. The helper must make intelligent decisions based upon very incomplete information. Usually, there is little time available to accumulate the information in order to make these decisions. Another disadvantage is that in crisis situations, the helper usually deals with less adaptable, less healthy people who have difficulty adjusting to life. Follow-up is also very difficult to arrange in emergency intervention relationships. Finally, limited resources tend to force a crisis resolution into less than an ideal compromise. These disadvantages should be considered as hurdles which make the interventionist's job more difficult, but not as a self-fulfilling prophecy for the failure of intervention techniques. Research could be conducted by communication scholars to determine the degree to which they prevent the facilitative communication for crisis intervention.

Brockopp (1972) developed specific criteria for intervention which relate to the above functions and disadvantages suggested by Rusk. These criteria were developed to help the crisis worker determine which individuals would be appropriate for crisis intervention:

A. Recognition by the crisis intervener that the person is in a state of impending or active crisis.
B. Determination of the severity of the crisis; i.e., whether the person is able to benefit from assistance outside of a hospital setting.
C. Recognition of suicidal and/or homicidal impulse in the client.
D. Motivation and ability of the client to use his personal resources and the resources of his neighborhood and community.
E. Acceptance by the client and worker of a treatment plan which is achievable within a four to six week time period.

F. Probability that he will be able to enlist appropriate referral sources for treatment of his client's problem. (p. 5)

Thus far we have examined the crisis in its broad categories as well as the specific stages and techniques and skills used to intervene and thus resolve the crisis. The remaining portion of this paper will turn to an examination of two specific crises as they relate to the previous discussion and to communication and growth promoting behavior.

Case Study--Suicide

This paper began with a question concerning whether or not the songwriter was planning to commit suicide. The underlying questions, of course, are why do people commit suicide and how crisis intervention relates to it? One could view it as a sociologist and say that suicide is a result of the inability of the individual to integrate with the social milieu. Psychiatrists or psychologists, on the other hand, might attribute it to some deep personality characteristic or childhood experience which disposes an individual toward suicide. Our question here is not why people commit suicide, but what is the relationship of suicide to crisis intervention and communication.

Miller (1967) developed a model of suicide based on three components which she labelled commitment, crisis, and communication. Commitment is a process by which an individual fixes on one self-concept to the exclusion of others and is unable to change when differing situations occur. The more narrow or rigid the self-concept, the more likely other forms of coping behavior cannot be accepted and thus, suicide might be viewed as the only way out of this very tight commitment. Communication, as viewed by Miller, is a process whereby individuals communicate with others openly and clearly in order to satisfy both the exchange of ideas, to test reality, and to test our own self-concept or others. Her view of crisis is similar to Caplan and others in that she defines it as a turning point which could bring about despair. If the function of communication are not served, the individual is faced with incomplete information and the possibility that distortions may occur. Ultimately, withdrawl, isolation, and anxiety may result. Miller concluded this point by saying that the individual begins to doubt his self-concept, feels worthless, and begins the downward spiral into a suicide condition. For her, communication or the lack thereof, plays a significant role in the emergence of suicidal threats or behavior.

This writer has received several letters which may be a cry for help and/or a sign of a potential suicide. The first letter expressed despondency over the suicide of a brother and the serious illness of a father. The second letter contained the following paragraph:

> I have two main concerns now. To be at peace with myself, and to be happy. The only trouble with having goals like this is that you want to wish them for everyone else. Most of us are still trying to find it and some of us have some of the answers. This concern for peace of mind and happiness is so basic that most people prefer to ignore it for financial security, or job accomplishments. I feel that without peace of mind and happiness, nothing makes any sense!!!!!

The third letter contained an itinerary of what had been labelled in

all letters as the "Last Trip Home." Will it be the last trip? No, if further communication can produce other adaptive behavior; attempts will be made to accomplish this behavior. As of this writing, other adaptive behaviors have prevented a potential suicide.

Breed (1972) suggested an elaboration of the Miller model in the form utilizing five components: (a) commitment; (b) rigidity; (c) failure; (d) shame; (e) isolation. These five components were based upon several years of research on individuals who either knew people who had committed suicide, or had a very close relationship with them. Breed's introduction of the fourth component, shame, provides a different perspective than the Miller model. This includes the prospective suicide victim's response to failure in some major role. Breed's social isolation can be considered similar to Miller's rubric-communication. To prevent social isolation, the individual has a need to receive the approval of other persons. This point came close to home as the writer was reminded by a colleague of the need to praise actors and actresses upon the completion of a production after he had failed to do so. Such approval would provide for legitimization and validation of the individual's identity. The presence of these five characteristics in 137 suicide cases can be seen in Figure 3. This figure is not only useful for its comparison on each of the items, but as an elaboration of the definition of each of the five components.

In addition to these components of suicidal behavior, certain specific behaviors can be noted for their relationship to communication. As stated in the beginning of this paper, approximately 83 percent of those who commit suicide, communicate that intent beforehand. The difficulty with communication of intent and actual suicide behavior is that noncommitters as well as committers communicate. Dorpat and Boswell (1963) reported that 83 percent of committers had previously within one year communicated their intent, whereas 78 percent of those who had only made suicidal gestures had not so communicated. Thus, communication of suicidal intent is one of those suicide specific signs that may exclude many persons who are suicidal but will never commit, while including those who eventually do so. Further research must be done in order to delineate between those who communicate an attempt to commit suicide and those who only make gestures toward suicide. When we know who is likely to be a committer, we can then attempt to develop growth-promoting behavior.

The communication of an intent to commit suicide was one type of crisis discussed by Lester and Lester (1971). Sometimes an individual does not really wish to die, but only wants to change the way other people act. An example of such a communicative intent that backfired was described at a recent suicidology meeting. A young lady had indicated to her husband many times that she was going to commit suicide if things didn't change. Her husband adopted a ritual of coming home and immediately going to the refrigerator for a can of beer. The woman, counting on such behavior, placed a note on the refrigerator saying that she had taken a quantity of sleeping pills. Her intent was that her husband would come home; find the note; rush to the bedroom; and take her to an emergency room before the pills had a chance to be fatal. Unfortunately, her husband decided to work late at the office, and her message was not received in time to prevent her suicide.

Lester and Lester suggested other suicidal crises including impulsive suicide behavior which results from anger, disappointment, or frustration. This crisis can be perceived as highly temporary, but could lead to a

FIGURE III: Presence of "Basic Suicide Syndrome" Characteristics in 137 New Orleans Suicides, by Sex (Presented in Percentages)

	Male (N=52)	Female (N=85)
Commitment		
1. Internalized cultural roles and goals very strongly	87	87
Rigidity		
2. Did not change goals	75	85
3. Did not change roles	67	82
4. Rigid on roles and goals, brittle cognitive and affective orientation	81	67
5. Pattern oriented, not person oriented	77	72
6. Failed to use ego defenses available to him	92	82
7. Had tunnel vision	81	87
Failure		
Males only		
8. Downward vertical mobility of any sort (work-life, intergenerational, or financial)	75	
9. Unemployed or not working full-time	50	
Females only		
10. Major problem was with husband or male		41
11. Was not living with husband at time of death		47
12. Never had a child		35
13. No child in household at time of death		62
14. Facade of femininity-wife, mother, etc., more of a role than an identity		58
Shame		
15. Low self-esteem (grades 3 and 4 on 4-point scale)	83	81
16. Depressed and felt worthless	83	78
17. Felt others "labeled" him as failure, "took the attitude of the other"	64	44
18. Felt shame, from failure	37	32
19. Goals lost their meaning	98	37
20. Loss of hope	83	70
Isolation		
21. Relatively few social contacts with others (grades 3 and 4 on 4-point scale)	43	41
22. Alone or felt alone	65	76
23. Felt like a "foreigner in life"	65	66
24. Kept problems to himself	69	56
25. Frustration of dependency needs	33	54
26. Problems with identity and independence	65	67
27. Part of him (her) is gone	27	57
28. Difficulties with disclosing self	44	42
29. Suicide intent communicated	44	47
30. Withdrew markedly from social relations during last year of life	29	36
31. Defensive about getting help	60	54
32. Showed all components of basic suicide syndrome	50	40

dysfunctional end.

A third crisis could be described as the individual who feels that life is no longer worth living and goes into a period of serious depression. The last form of suicidal crisis results from very serious illness such as cancer or some other terminal disease. This suicidal crisis emerges as a result of the individual trying to spare the loved one the difficulty of caring for him during his terminal disease.

Each of these crises represents different needs with regard to intervention strategies. While the impulsive can be dealt with on an empathetic level, attempts to counsel a potential suicide whose problem is serious illness calls for a thorough grounding of pertinent information, as well as the ability to convince the helpee that other viable alternatives are available for coping with the crisis. Research is needed that tests the effectiveness of particular intervention strategies and techniques with each form of suicidal crisis.

As suggested earlier, we know the percentage of people who cry for help by forewarning through communication of their intent to commit suicide. Unfortunately, we are not sophisticated enough to decipher those who simply want to make a suicidal gesture through communication, and those who are actually serious in their intent, and who will ultimately commit suicide. What is lacking is a regression model which would help us distinguish between those who are suicide-prone and those who would ultimately commit suicide.

We have explored suicide as just one crisis of the multitude that is present each day. While it is suggested that suicide is the antithesis of growth-promoting behavior, we can conclude that the adequate resolution of crisis at any level can be considered growth-promoting behavior.

Case Study-Organization

As suicide was an example of an intrapersonal crisis, organizational crises can be viewed as either group and/or interpersonal crisis. Lippitt and Schmidt (1967) discussed six types of crises which they felt an organization could face. These occur anytime from the birth of the organization through its maturity. First, entrepreneurs must answer the question, how much are they willing to risk as they gamble on a new business? For example, potential land barons in Arizona face the problem of deciding whether or not land purchases in the White Mountains would be a viable venture. In line with our earlier definitions of crisis, these individuals are faced with a decision as to whether or not to risk dollars, time, energy, and their reputations in order to invest in land.

Having made the decision to launch a business venture, the second major crisis concerned the organization's ability to survive as a viable system. This raised the question, how much is the organization willing to sacrifice? With three-fourths of all new businesses in the United States failing to survive their first year of operation and less than half of the remainder continuing in operation, this question becomes paramount.

If this crisis is dealt with effectively, the organization can then be confronted by a third crisis. Lippitt and Schmidt labelled the third crisis as the achievement of stability. The question raised by this crisis is: how willing are the individuals involved to be organized and accept and enforce discipline? In the sense, the question is: are they willing to be institutionalized?

The fourth crisis was labelled one of pride and reputation. This

crisis suggested that management of an organization must face up to the constant need for monitoring, reviewing, evaluation, and ultimately improvement. Most often, this crisis would probably not occur until one realized that the opposition had done something to improve their image and thus the marketability of their product. Alka Seltzer faced this crisis when they discovered that their commercials, while interesting, funny, and winning Clio awards, were failing to sell the product to the American public.

The fifth crisis for an organization was that of developing uniqueness. How willing is an organization to adapt or cope with change? A certain Midwestern university failed to listen to their president when he suggested changes that would make their organization unique in higher education. This crisis, of course, is always balanced by the other crises already discussed. Thus, the fear of change overcame the potential for uniqueness of that school.

Finally, a sixth type of organizational crisis was labelled, contribution to society. The question that executives must face is: What are we willing to give to society without expecting a direct return? Not all organizations believe that this is something that should even concern them.

Not all organizations face these crises nor do they all suffer the same severity. Much depends on the extent of the conceived organizational need and on the organization's financial status with regard to those needs. These are, however, crises that each organization can and probably does face.

Fink, Beak, and Taddeo (1971) modified the Fink model of an individual crisis and adapted it through extrapolation for an organizational crisis. Figure 4 presents the parameters of this model as it relates to the phases of crisis. Unlike the individual crisis model, this model can be tied to communication immediately. The categories on interpersonal relations, intergroup relations, problem-solving, and leadership and decision-making all relate to various forms of communication. Obviously, research should be conducted to see whether or not the results suggested by the authors can be found in each of the four phases over time.

Returning to that Midwestern university, as an example, the author was present when the Higher Board of Education for the state demanded that each university face a potential 15 percent cut due to declining enrollment. While each of the schools in the state went through the various phases suggested by Fink, et. al., not all of them remained in each category for any length of time. The Midwestern university with which I was most familiar, passed quickly from the shock and defensive retreat stage into the acknowledgment and adaption portion of the model. Other schools remained in the shock period or defensive retreat period for much greater lengths of time. The behaviors found in each of the categories can be attributed to each of the universities. While the Fink, et. al., model was not used for the basis of a new volume on that university crisis, see Berlo (in press) for a detailed elaboration of the event.

Figure 5 presents the requirements needed by an organization in order to effectively deal with the crises. Although the crises discussed were developed by Lippitt and Schmidt, they should apply to an organization whether or not the product is the most important aspect of the company's existence. It should be noted that communication is seen to be a major part of the skills necessary for the amelioration of each of the crises.

FIGURE IV: Phases of Organizational Crisis

PHASE	INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONS	INTER-GROUP RELATIONS	COMMUNI-CATION	LEADERSHIP AND DECISION-MAKING	PROBLEM HANDLING	PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING	STRUCTURE
Shock	Fragmented	Disconnected	Random	Paralyzed	None	Dormant	Chaotic
Defensive Retreat	Protective Cohesion	Alienated	Ritualized	Autocratic	Mechanistic	Expedient	Traditional
Acknowl-edgment	Confront-ation (suppor-tive)	Mutuality	Searching	Participa-tive	Explorative	Synthesi-zing	Experi-menting
Adaptation and Change	Interdepen-dent	Coordinated	Authentic Congruent	Task-Cent-ered	Flexible	Exhaustive and Integrative	Organic

16

Figure V

Requirements to Meet Crises

Critical concern	Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes
To create a system	Clearly perceived short-range objective in mind of top man	Ability to transmit knowledge into action by self and into orders to others	Belief in own ability, product, and market
To survive	The short-range objectives that need to be communicated	Communications know-how; ability to adjust to changing conditions	Faith in future
To stabilize	How top man can predict relevant factors and make long-range plans	Ability to transmit planning knowledge into communicable objectives	Trust in other members of organization
To earn good reputation	Planning know-how and understanding of goals on part of whole executive team	Facility of allowing others a voice in decision making, involving others in decision making and obtaining commitments from them, and communicating objectives to customers	Interest in customers
To achieve uniqueness	Understanding on part of policy team of how others should set own objectives, and of how to manage subunits of the organization	Ability to teach others to plan; proficiency in integrating plans of subunits into objectives and resources of organization	Self-confidence
To earn respect and appreciation	General management understanding of the larger objectives or organization and of society	Ability to apply own organization and resources to the problems of the larger community	Sense of responsibility to society and mankind

Conclusion

Throughout this paper we have seen examples of where communication has led into a crisis when it became dysfunctional. On the other hand, it is perhaps one of the only ways which allows us to deal with crisis. Research in crisis and crisis intervention, while thoroughly documented in the psychological and psychiatric literature, is certainly an area on which our field has yet to focus its attention. We have neglected our responsibilities for research in crisis intervention. Members of the International Communication Association have recently recognized a need for a concerted effort in this direction when they formed a division of therapeutic communication. While we should be utilitarian in our approach to psychological and sociological literature on crisis, we should be perceptive enough to realize that communication scholars must make a concerted effort to provide a basis for essentially what is a communication skill--crisis intervention.

REFERENCES

Arnold, W. E. Diffusion of information about crisis centers. Crisis Intervention. 1972, 4, 7-13.

Arnold, W. E., Liddell, C., & Findling, J. Diffusion of information about crisis intervention services. Crisis Intervention. 1974, 5, 2-11.

Back, K. Intervention techniques: Small groups. Annual Review of Psychology. 1974, 25, 367-387.

Berlo, D. University in crisis. Unpublished manuscript, 1974.

Breed, W. Five components of a basic suicide syndrome. Life-Threatening Behavior. 1972, 2, 3-18.

Brockopp, G. Selecting the crisis intervener. Crisis Intervention. 1972, 4, 33-39.

Brockopp, G., & Hoff, L. Crisis intervention services and community mental health programs. Crisis Intervention. 1972, 4, 1-7.

Buley, J. Information restriction and the duration of the initial contact between strangers. Unpublished paper, 1973.

Caplan, G. Principles of preventive psychiatry. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Carkhuff, R. Helping and human relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1969. 2 vols.

Cowen, E. School and community interventions. Annual Review of Psychology. 1973, 24, 423-472.

Dorpat, T., & Boswell, J. W. An evaluation of suicidal intent in suicide attempts. Comprehensive Psychiatry. 1963, 4, 117-125.

Eliot, T. D. Handling family strains and shocks. In H. Becker & R. Hill (Ed.), Family, Marriage and Parenthood. Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1949.

Emmert, P., & Arnold, W. E. Persuasion. Unpublished manuscript, 1973.

Erikson, E. Identity and the life cycle. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

Fink, S. L. Crisis and motivation: A theoretical model. Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation. 1967, 48, 592-597.

Fink, S. L., Beak, J., & Taddeo, K. Organizational crisis and change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 1971, 7, 15-41.

Gaullorakis, M. The diffusion of information about PATH at Illinois State University. Unpublished thesis, Illinois State University, 1971.

Gottschalk, L., & Gleser, G. The measurement of psychological states through the content analysis of verbal behavior. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Hill, R. Generic features of families under stress. Social Casework. 1958, 39, 139-150.

Lester, G., & Lester, D. Suicide: The gamble with death. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Lippitt, G., & Schmidt, W. Crises in a developing organization. Harvard Business Review. 1967, 45, 102-112.

Miller, D. H. Suicide careers: Toward a symbolic interaction theory of suicide. Unpublished dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1967.

Pasework, R., & Albers, D. Crisis intervention: Theory in search of a program. Social Work. 1972, 17, 70-77.

Ruesch, J. Therapeutic communication. New York: W. W. Norton, 1961.

Rusk, T., & Gerner, R. A study of the process of emergency psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychiatry. 1972, 128, 882-886.

Scott, M., & Lashbrook, B. Man-machine interface: A reconceptualization of communication education. Unpublished paper, 1974.

Shannon, C., & Weaver, W. The mathematical theory of communication. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Toffler, A. Future shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

A RESPONSE TO WILLIAM E. ARNOLD'S PAPER, "COMMUNICATION, CRISIS, AND GROWTH PROMOTING BEHAVIOR"

William D. Brooks
Purdue University

The purpose of Arnold's paper, as he identifies it is "to examine the relationship of crisis, communication, and growth promoting behavior." To examine the interrelationship among crises, communication and growth promoting behavior is a noble undertaking, but one that may well be beyond the realm of possibility in one paper at this point in time. As a part or my preparation for responding to Arnold's paper, I called three persons engaged in research, teaching, and practice in crisis intervention at two major universities. I was pursuing the question, "What do we know about crisis, crisis intervention, the role of communication in crisis situations, and the interrelationships among crisis, communication, and growth promoting behavior?" What is the "state of the art"? All three professors gave me the same answer. Don Kartsough's answer, typical of all those I called, (He teaches courses in Crisis Intervention and is engaged in research in crisis intervention at Purdue and, also, directs the "Crisis Center" in our community.) was, "What Research? We don't have much research!" He went ahead to say that the area in which most crisis research has been done is suicide. Arnold's paper reflects that same fact. It seems, that by and large, we are operating out of untested theoretical models. Programs of crisis intervention are designed from that base, courses are taught from that orientation, and published articles, for the most part, are written at that level. It is not surprising, therefore, that Arnold's paper also fits that mold. What else can one say at this time? The objective selected by Arnold, then, is an ambitious one. Consequently, we do not have a thorough and rigorous examination of relationships in his paper, but, rather, a discussion of hypothesized variables and their interrelationships. This does not detract from the worth of the paper, for Arnold's paper makes a significant contribution to the field of communication, but it does suggest that the objective of the paper might well have been modified.

The most significant value of Arnold's paper, as well as the other papers presented at this conference, will be to call attention to and encourage the speech communication profession to become concerned with crisis communication, and to suggest directions for our research and study. Our area has not given adequate attention to crisis intervention and the role of communication in it. We have neglected our responsibilities for research in crisis communication, especially for basic research. And that brings me to the points I wish to make in relation to this topic generally (i.e., Crisis, Communication, and Growth Promoting Behavior), and to Arnold's paper specifically.

As Arnold says on page 2 of his paper, the interrelationships among crisis, communication, and growth promoting behavior have not been explored; and, as Hartsough and the others with whom I talked indicated, there is a void of basic research in crisis and crisis intervention. There is then, a need for basic research--basic research in four steps. It seems to me that if we are to come to an accurate understanding of crisis communication and growth promoting behavior, and if we are to acquire expertise in effectively influencing crisis resolution with maximum efficiency, we need to attain these enabling objectives. First, we need research that adequately describes crises, crisis communication (effective, ineffective, or whatever it may be), and growth promoting behavior. Such research needs to cover the various kinds of crisis situations according to the category systems and models identified or proposed by Arnold, for example. This research needs to be as full and accurate as possible. Without this data base, study and investigation are inefficient and slow.

Second, we need research aimed at discovering and describing the characteristics and patterns of crisis communication that relate consistently to growth promoting behavior, as well as discovering those characteristics and patterns that relate consistently to the inhibition of growth--to unsuccessful crisis resolution. The research of Fink (p. 13 of Arnold) and Pasework and Albers is a start in this direction. Much, much more is needed with the focus being more directly on communication variables.

Third, principles need to be hypothesized and field and laboratory experiments conducted aimed at testing those principles. Only as we learn to manipulate variables in accordance with tested principles and relationships can we influence crisis resolution constructively and predictively.

Fourth, given the completion of the first three levels of research, we can devise programs of various purposes and test them for efficiency.

There are, of course, other ways (hit and miss ways) of trying to deal with crisis and crisis communication, but the accepted scientific approach resting on basic, hard-data research, seems to me to be the most productive way to proceed and the most needed work at this time.

We know there are numerous problems the communication researcher faces in doing communication research in any setting, including that of crisis situations. Those problems, identified profusely in our literature, include the difficulty of study dynamic, complex processes such as communication, the limitations imposed by our procedures, and the limitations and biases of the instruments we have available. Beyond that, there are special problems related to crisis communication. Namely, the difficulty of gaining access to crises in sites and the restraints that mitigate against the unobtrusive investigation and description of crises and crisis communication. As Arnold states, (p. 3) "It is not always possible to deal with individuals facing the crisis state. As a result, one must either deal with simulation

exercises and their outcome, or apply research of traditional communication to the crisis setting." The problems are not insoluable, however, and increasing sophistication in the analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior, as sell as in multivariate and "process oriented" research procedures hold great promise for us.

A second point I wish to make is that we need to discover what we know at this time--what we know from the reports of those experienced in crisis intervention, the application via analogy of what we know of communication in other situations to crisis situations, and theoretical conceptualizations relative to crisis resolution. These are the three springboards of most of the available literature now, with a few exceptions such as the psychology of suicide and suicide prevention. Among the outstanding contributions of Arnold's paper is the application of communication principles to crisis intervention. His review, as well as those reviews we have from psychology, however, are not based on data from basic research. In addition to these reviews, we need a comprehensive critical evaluation and synthesization of reported research findings. A good "state of the art" paper would help us to know where we are, and, hence, where we must go.

A third question to which we need answers is "What should we be studying?" What questions should we be asking? With what variables should we be concerned? Arnold identifies some for us. Although his paper did not focus directly on this question, he does indirectly identify them specifically and list them. Arnold suggests we test the application of credibility principles to the role of the crisis interventionist, the application of communication training to crisis interventionists' training, the testing of the many scales and evaluation procedures we use in communication to crisis situations, crisis communication, and crisis intervention. Also, in reviewing the literature, Arnold, has identified types of crisis situations, each different in terms of intensity or severity, in terms of persons when the crisis involves (family or non-family) and in terms of source of the probles (input phase, processing phase, and output phase). This identification and categorization of types of crises helps considerably in our selecting problems to be studied, identifying questions to be asked, and constructing hypotheses to be tested. When crises include attending school for the first time, puberty, marriage, retirement, divorce, death, blindness, dessertion, infidelity, alcoholism, illness, accidents, war, floods, economic depression, a runaway child, loss of job, etc., the generalizability of a given finding in one study relative to one kind of crisis may be difficult and tenuous. Without a valid taxonomy it would be difficult to evaluate research, interpret it accurately, integrate it, and apply it correctly. Indeed, the establishment of taxonomies of types of crises is a necessary step. They aid us in focusing our research more sharply and in identifying the limitations to which given findings are subject. Not only is Arnold's review of the category systems helpful at this point, but, also his systems model is quite valuable in this respect since it can serve a needed hueristic function.

Among other variables identified by Arnold as ones we should study, or questions we ought to be asking, or hypothesized relationships we ought to test are: sensory deprivation; information overload (both sensory and cognitive) decision stress; forms of individual maladaptation; "prediction of future events" confidence of individuals; anticipation crises; decision-making in situations of rapid change; the relationship of group characteristics to group crises (values, organization, etc.--all the variables we have identified in groups); the effect of shock, defensiveness (retreatment), acknowledgement, etc. upon crisis resolution; the effect of the same variables (shock, etc.) upon perception, problem-solving and communication; the relationship of personal skills, traits, and psychological orientations to coping with crises; the identification of superior helpers (crisis interventionists) and description of their skills (i.e., empathic understanding of interpersonal process, facilitative genuiness, and facilitative self-disclosure, etc.); and, development of instruments and procedures to identify persons is a state of impending or active crisis in order to determine severity of the crisis, to recognize homocidal or suicidal impulses, and to determine ability of the person in crisis to use his personal resources.

A more comprehensive and logical identification of questions to ask, variables to study, and hypotheses to test will be possible as thorough and valid descriptive research is done. Until then, Arnold's paper does provide us direction, frames of reference, and entry points for studying crisis communication and growth promoting behavior.

Now, to four points related specifically to Arnold's paper. The first is a question relative to his definition of crisis. He says, "Crisis is defined for this paper as a decision-making point when an individual, group, organization, state, or nation is unable to cope without some form of assistance." (p. 4) The definition seems unnecessarily narrow. It rules out those situations having all the characteristics of crises that Arnold and others discuss except that the person, group, organization, or nation is capable of ultimately resolving the crisis without assistance from some other person, group, organization, or nation. According to Arnold's definition, if the individual, regardless of the intensity and difficulty of the decision-making situation, manages through his own resources to resolve the crisis, it was not a crisis. Moreover, Arnold's definition (p. 4) seems to be inconsistent with what he says on page three, i.e., "When the individual has the capability either through his own volition or with the help of a crisis interventionist to deal with the crisis and all its ramifications, he has engaged in growth promoting behavior." In this statement there is the recognition that a person can experience a crisis and deal with it through his own volition. Then on page four, Arnold says, "Individuals who have faced a crisis and have resolved it have adapted to their environment." Arnold, also, identifies numerous examples of crises commonly faced by many persons. Surely, some persons resolve such crises

through their own resources. For example, he refers to tornadoes (p. 2) (I know persons who through their own resources have coped with such a crisis.) and to information overload (Is it not possible for a person to possess skills and knowledge permitting him to recognize this type of crisis and to resolve it by removing himself from the environment, or, in other ways, reducing the in-coming information?). Surely some soldiers in battle, to use an example from Arnold's paper, although experiencing high anxiety and the other characteristics of crisis, are able to cope with that situation. As Arnold points out, there is simply not time for a therpeutic conference in battle. And in job opportunity situations, surely some are able to cope successfully on their own, difficult as the decision may be. Similarly, the convention-goer (p. 10) who reaches a "crisis state" due to lack or rest could go to bed by himself (I think I mean "on his own") as a crisis resolution strategy.

It is true that Arnold recognizes in several places in his paper that an individual might have the resources necessary to resolve his crisis. He quoted or paraphrased other scholars who made the same observation, too. Then, on page six, Arnold refers to an "in press" work (with Emmert) in which they suggest that one of the basic needs of all individuals is to maintain consistency or a state of homeostasis. Crisis is then viewed by Arnold as any situation which arouses inconsistency or imbalance, and crisis resolution is any return to consistency or equilibrium. Again, we know that it is possible, and indeed it ought to be our objective, for a person to develop personal resources that enable him to cope with inconsistency. The objective of his conference focuses on <u>personal growth</u>. Communication is a vehicle for facilitating the development of personal resources, but it should not be a crutch. The narrow definition of crisis places undue responsibility for coping with life (puberty, marriage, retirement, divorce, illness, accidents, war, flood, loss of job, dessertion, infidelity, etc.) on crisis interventionists. Perhaps, we need to emphasize the goal of helping the individual to face and better resolve crises through the development of his own resources.

It seems to me, then, that an essential characteristic of the crisis phenomenon that ought to be included in any definition of crisis is the "perception on the part of the individual (group, state, nation, etc.) <u>of impending danger or threat that calls for decision-making and action in order for the threat or danger to be averted</u>. Even though the individual finds the resources within himself to resolve the crisis, or even through serendipity resolves the crisis, it was a crisis, nevertheless. The characterisitc I am referring to is that identified by Kaplan as "emotional reaction to a hazardous situation" (1964), by Fink as "a problem which poses a threat to the system" (1971), by Erikson as "a crucial moment" (1968), and by Arnold as "inconsistency or imbalance" in his paper.

The second specific question I wish to ask relative to Arnold's paper is "Is communication the only way to resolve a crisis?" On page four, Arnold states, "communication is seen as an essential part of the process. Without communication, resolution would be impossible." At this point, I will not develop an argument against the statement, but simply raise the question as to whether or not the statement claims too much for communication, and rules out instinctive response patterns, learned response patterns, and other avenues of crisis resolution?

A third observation I would make constitutes simply an underscoring of Arnold's use of the word "assumption" on page 6 when he discusses the applicability of communication research on existing variables to crisis communication and crisis intervention. It may be true that some of our research findings will apply. Much of our research, however, has focused on the short speech to persuade, the credibility of the speaker, the use of light, moderate or strong fear appeals, or of one-sided vs two-sided arguments in a short speech to an audience. Often, the concern has been with voting or with some political or social issue of society. Indeed, the transfer of the findings from the communication research our profession has done is tenuous. Such transfer and applicability to crisis communication must be tested!

Finally, a fourth point, which constitutes, also, an underscoring of the point made by Arnold in his paper, is that his paper does not treat all areas of crisis, and does not review all models of crisis intervention (Arnold, page 6). Such a review and evaluation would be a beneficial "first step" in determining the "state of the art".

Arnold's paper makes a significant contribution to our profession as we prepare to respond to this area of concern. He is to be complimented on his review and synthesis of category systems or taxonomies of types of crises, for his own taxonomy, for his process frame of reference which might profitably be used by others in reviewing and integrating the literature, and for his identification of principles and programs we might test for applicability to crisis communication.

THE NEED FOR COMMUNICATION RESEARCH IN CARELINE SERVICES: A LITTLE TO DO ABOUT MUCH

Hugh McGinley

University of Wyoming

In his paper "Communication, Crisis, and Growth Promoting Behavior" Arnold (1974) reviews a balanced selection of the applied, research and theoretical literature that is related to communication in crisis situations. The present paper will comment only upon one of the many kinds of crises that were discussed by Arnold, the interpersonal crisis situation. Furthermore, the focus of this discussion will be upon the telephone service type of crisis intervention.

Crisis Telephone Service

According to Slem and Cotler (1973) the approximately 500 crisis telephone services in the United States may be divided into three types.[1] Type I is a referral system where an operator broadly assesses the needs of callers and then refers them to other helping agencies. Type II is a component system of a multiservice center. The primary function of the component system is to assign callers to appropriate subunits of the center. The third type of telephone service is commonly referred to as a crisis intervention telephone service. This service is designed to help callers use their own resources and abilities in solving or ameliorating their personal crises. The usual service worker in all three types of services is a nonprofessional and workers in the type III system are usually volunteers. Of the three types, only the crisis intervention telephone service system can readily be said to promote personality and behavior growth through communication.

Crisis Intervention Telephone Service

The precursor of the crisis intervention telephone service (hereafter referred to as a "careline service") was probably the Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center which was established in the late 1950's in connection

---

[1]The estimate of about 500 crisis telephone services is probably quite conservative.

with Farberow and Shneidman's research program in suicide behavior (Helig, 1968). In the late 1960's, careline services were created prodigiously. Public Law 89-749, a law requiring that the majority of the membership of community mental health center boards shall be representatives of the consumers of health services (that is, at least half of the membership of such boards must be other than health-field professionals) and the popular acceptance of Carkhuff and Truax's finding that lay persons may function as well as professionals in certain "helping" roles may have been major factors in both the explosive establishment of careline services and their reliance upon nonprofessional, volunteer workers.[2] Whatever the causal factors of careline services, they exist and exist in great numbers.

Many careline services are either directly or indirectly associated with institutions of higher education. Inasmuch as most behavioral science research is done by persons who are also associated with these institutions it would seem to follow that careline services should be well researched and this has been the case. The research, however, has been essentially demographic in nature. For instance, it is usual for careline workers to obtain personal information from callers such as sex, age, contact telephone number, name, etc. The amount and kind of information requested depends on the type of careline service (teenage hotline, suicide prevention, family problems, etc.). Also, workers usually record the type and duration of calls they receive. The type of calls fall into two general catefories, noncontact and contact. Noncontact calls include hang-ups, wrong numbers and silent calls. Contact calls are where a worker interacts enough with a help-seeking caller to assume that the interaction is potentially therapeutic or informational to the caller. Contact calls are further categorized as to the worker's judgment of the caller's problem, anxiety state and resources (see Stern, 1972; Brockopp, 1973; Slem & Cotler, 1973). The descriptive information can be used to evaluate the careline service in terms of time and cost per patient (O'Neil et al., 1973). Other research that has appeared in the literature deals with both the personality characteristics of careline volunteers (Resnick, 1968; Lester & Williams, 1971; McClure et al., 1973; Truax, Altmann & Millis, 1974) and their interpersonal effectiveness á la Truax and Carkhuff's dimensions of counselor effectiveness (Knickerbocker & McGee, 1973). In general, it has been found that persons whovolunteer to work at careline centers have a high occurrence of psychological problems. On the more positive side, volunteer workers compare vaorably with professionls in Carkhuff and Truax's dimensions of counselor effectiveness: genuineness, respect, concreteness, self-disclosure and empathy.

The literature cited thus far, with the exception of Slem and Cotler (1973), is not of much academic interest to communicationists. Slem and Cotler attempted to find out how well careline personnel were able to communicated with their target clientele. This was done by creating

---

[2]The credit for this finding cannot be contributed solely to Carkhuff and Truax (1965) as other investigators of the 1960s reported simpiliar findings.

a questionnaire that was designed to assess the careline service's effectiveness and then administering it to persons in the center's target population area. Although this work may fit into the domain of communication research it would be making "a lot to do out of a little" to say that the work fits a theme of communication and growth promoting behavior.

Careline Services and Communication that Promotes Growth

Communication entails a variation of energy. In interpersonal communication, energy variations are received by a person's sensory system and then decoded. If the meaning of the decoded information is congruent with the meaning intended by the encoder then an intentional communication has occured. In the same vein, an unintentional communication may occur when a person causes an energy variation which is not encoded but which accurately reflects the person's cognitive or affective state and this energy variation is then received and decoded by another person with meaning that is in accord with the communicator's state. Unintentional miscommunication occurs in three general situations: (1) When a person intends to communicate but the encoded message is decoded by another person to mean other than what was intended, (2) when a person intends to communicate but errs in encoding his message and the receiver of the message decodes the message appropriate to its encoding, and (3) when a person who does not intend to communicate causes energy variations that are decoded by another person as having meaning that in fact is not true. (For balance purposes there should be a general category called intentional miscommunication but I cannot think of what the conditions of such a category would be. Indeed, if a person intentionally and successfully misleads another person the case would be one of intentional communication. If a person intends to mislead another person but fails to do so then the case would be one of unintentional miscommunication).[3]

If we are to assess the cause and effect relationship between communication and growth promoting behavior we should be able to ascertain both a person's behavior following a specific communication and his perception of the content of that communication. When we speak of assessing the effect of a careline counselor's communication upon a caller we must direct our research emphasis on what the caller perceived to be the content of his conversation with the worker. It is of only secondary value to assess what the counselor thought went on or to have "objective" raters make judgments on what they thought was communicated. This is not to say,

---

[3]One might wish to include a category of no communication which may exist when one has been psychologically or physiologically cut off from his sensory world. No communication would be a case of encoding but no decoding.

however, that these latter areas are not important.[4] In line with the notion that natural setting research is not easy to conduct it is fitting to note that making an assessment of a caller's view of what was said (and meant) during a conversation with a careline counselor is an extremely difficult thing to do. It may be even more difficult to attempt to define and record the occurrence of growth promoting behavior that is the result of a communication. Indeed, the problem seems to be none other than a reification of the problem of evaluating the effectiveness of psychotherapy. Whatever the difficulties involved, the study of the effects of careline counselor-careline caller communication is dependent upon the delineation and measurement of caller behaviors that are defined as growth promoting. For instance, Lester (1970) recorded careline counselor-caller conversations and then rated the counselor for their genuineness, respect, concreteness, self-disclosure and empathy. The only dimension that appeared to be related to whether a patient later showed up to an appointment was the dimension of concreteness. Obviously, it would not be profitable, research-wise, to limit the measure used in defining growth promoting behavior to something as narrow as "appointment keeping" but it would certainly behoove communication researchers to clearly define various dependent measures of growth promoting behavior and attest to their validity.

An understanding of the relationship between communication and growth promoting behavior may be inferred from the growth promoting behavior if such behavior is well defined and measureable. The previously cited work by Lester (1970) provides an example of this tactic (please keep in mind that Lester was not interested in communication as such and that, for didactic purposes, I may be taking broad and unusual liberties with his work). We could view the careline counselor's scheduling of an appointment for the caller as the operational definition of the independent variable (communication) while the experimental measure of the dependent variable (growth promoting behavior) would be the caller's appointment keeping behavior. If the caller were to actually keep his appointment we might wish to make three subjective inferences: (1) an intentional communication occurred, (2) there is a positive relationship between the intentional communication and growth promoting behavior, and (3) this relationship is a cause and effect relationship. Had we considered a case where the caller were to fail to keep his appointment we would not have been able to make the three previously listed subjective inferences because the caller's failure to keep an appointment would not infer a lack of intentional communication -- the caller could have been deterred by events beyond his

---

[4] A footnote entry to remind us that our concern is with the effect of communication on a caller's growth promoting behavior and therefore our appropriate target is communication as the caller sees it. This research approach does not exclude cross referencing the caller's perception (alas, report) with information obtained from the counselor and others.

control (weigh the probability of this possibility against the probability that the caller "just happened" to appear at a specific center at a specific time). There could be no assessment of the relationship between communication and growth promoting behavior if there were no knowledge of one of the events, intentional communication. Without knowledge of such a relationship there could be no inference of cause and effect.

Each of the illustrations that were just used were based on a single subject case. It is extremely rare for research in the behavioral sciences to be based on data that are collected from a single subject. Because of this, let us reconsider the two single subject examples as cases involving many subjects. Suppose that 100 out of 100 callers who had been counseled to contact another service agency actually did so. We would not only be able to change our three subjective inferences to statistical inferences but we could also infer, with a high level of confidence, that yet to be heard from callers would keep their referral appointments. On an emperical basis we would probably feel quite safe in making this fourth inference because of our knowledge of a history of correlational events. At the same time, those of us who are more theory oriented might evoke the intervening variable of intentional communication as an explanation of why callers would keep their appointments. We would also recognize that such an explanation reflects a very low level understanding of the relationship between communication and growth promoting behavior. We should be able to further our knowledge of this relationship by carefully examining the individual dyadic conversations between counselors and callers for between-case consistencies. Referring back to Lester's study (1970) we find that he did exactly the kind of thing that we are talking about when he used audio recordings of counselor-caller conversations to evaluate the counselors on Truax and Corkhuff's counselor effectiveness dimensions of genuineness, respect, concreteness, self-disclosure and empathy. Lester's findings suggest that a counselor's concreteness may be an important variable of intentional communication -- they give some idea (food for thought) of what may be one of the causes of intentional communication. However, if we are to understand what it is about a communication situation that leads to intentional communication (or unintentional communication, or unintentional miscommunication, or no communication) then the problem must be attacked directly. Such a research attack must involve a systematic investigation of variables that could underlie the resolve of a communication situation. In a dyadic communication situation the focal points of study are the individual characteristics and situational variables that are associated with the two interactants and their interactions For example, we should be aware of communicator expectations if we are to try to understand interpersonal interactions. As a hint of the importance of personal expectations in psychotherapy we have the words of Jerome Frank (1962):

> Despite the energetic efforts of many researchers, the accumulation of reliable knowledge about psychotherapy has been

> disappointingly slow. Among the reasons for this is the fact that the expectations of patient and therapist seem to affect therapeutic process and outcome, and expectations are difficult to deal with experimentally. This problem is not unique to psychotherapy. Very few aspects of human functioning can be really understood without including a person's view of the future. Humans are continually forming goals, making plans, and rehearsing their reactions to anticipated future events. ..A person's expectations affect his perceptions of what goes on about him and thereby his behavior. His conduct in turn affects the ways in which others perceive him and their behavior towards him. Thus one cannot understand a person's state of mind or his behavior without consideration of his expectations about himself and those with whom he interacts.(pg. ix).

Referring again to Lester's study, it may well have been that callers who kept their appointments were those who expected and desired to be referred to a face-to-face interaction with a therapist and that the careline counselor's concreteness simply reinforced the callers' thought that they were doing what was best for them. The intentional communication that was previously discussed could be considered to have been due to the fact that the compatibility of the counselor's encodings and the caller's decodings were enhanced by the caller's cognitive set. On the other hand, it is possible that a caller who has an expectation that differs with a counselor's expectations will incorrectly decode the counselor's message. This would be a case of unintentional miscommunication.

A Reiteration

We cannot understand the effect of a careline counselor-careline caller communication on a caller's growth promoting behavior unless we both assess the caller's perception of the communication and measure his subsequent physical and/or cognitive behavior. When we have done this we will have lightly scratched the surface of the problem. A more complete understanding of the effects of communication on growth promoting behavior demands the investigation of caller needs, how these needs may be satisfied either directly or indirectly through communication and what are the dynamics that underlie communication. The paths to these various levels of understanding are fraught with frustration, research artifact and extraordinary complexity which can only be overcome by long termed and well financed systematic research. The plea for this research cannot be too strong if we are to take the stance that science should be in the service of man.

REFERENCES

Arnold, W. E. Communication, crisis, and growth promoting behaviors. A paper presented at the University of Wyoming summer conference in communication, June, 1974, Laramie.

Brockopp, G. W. An emergency telephone service: the development of a presence. In D. Lester and G. W. Brockopp (Eds.) Crisis Intervention and Counseling by Telephone. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Corkhuff, R. R. & Truax, C. B. Lay mental health counseling. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 426-432.

Frank, J. D. The foreward of A. P. Goldstein, Therapist-Patient Expectancies in Psychotherapy. New York: MacMillan, 1962.

Helig, S. M. The Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center. Dr. N. L. Farberow (Ed.), Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference for Suicide Prevention. Los Angeles: Delmar, 1968. As cited in McColskey, A. S. Models of crisis intervention: The crisis counseling model. In G. A. Spector & W. L. Claiborn (Eds.) Crisis Intervention. Behavioral Publications

Knickerbocker, D. A., & McGee, R. K. Clinical effectiveness of nonprofessional and professional telephone workers on a crisis intervention center. In D. Lester & G. W. Brokopp (Eds.) Crisis Intervention and Counseling by Telephone. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Lester, D. Steps toward the evaluation of a suicide prevention center: part four. Crisis Intervention, 1970, 2, 20-22.

Lester, D., & Williams, T. The volunteer in suicide prevention. Crisis Intervention, 1971, 3, 87-91.

McClure, J. N., Wetzel, R. D., Flanagan, T. A., McCabe, M., & Murphy, G. E. Volunteers in a suicide prevention service. Journal of Community Psychology, 1973, 1, 397-398.

O'Neil, H. F. Jr., Richardson, F. C., Carver, D., & Iscoe, I. A systems analysis of a campus community mental health facility: A preliminary investigation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1973, 1, 362-376.

Public Law 80-749. Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966. November 3, 1966.

Resnick, H. L. P. Suicidal Behaviors: Diagnosis and Management, New York: Little Brown, 1968.

Slem, C. M. & Cotler , S. Crisis phone services: Evaluation of a hotline program. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1973, 1, 219-227.

Stern, S. Operation of a crisis intervention center. In G. A. Specter & W. L. Claiborn (Eds.), Crisis Intervention. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Truax, C. B., Altmann, H., & Millis, W. A. Jr. Therapeutic relationships provided by various professionals. Journal of Community Psychology, 1974, 2, 33-36.

PRESENT STATE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR

As will be obvious from the final paper by Miller and Emmert, there have been serious conceptual problems in research in this area. Even with these problems, however, research concerning communication and personal growth has proceeded in a multitude of directions. The papers in this section focus upon past research and suggest new directions for future research. The major position paper is by Larry Barker, Aburn University and Loretta Malandro, Arizona State University. The responses to their paper are by Carl Larson, University of Denver, and Patrick McDermett, University of Wyoming.

111

THE PRESENT STATE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS OF GROWTH PROMOTING COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR

Larry L. Barker, Auburn University
Loretta A. Malandro, Arizona State University

Introduction

"Whatever your experience of life to date--tell me, are you satisfied with that? You may say, 'But I'm happy! I have money, friends, a loving family.' Nice, I reply. But back to my question: Are you satisfied?

You well know the answer! Whatever you have of things so long as things seem meaningful to you, you will always want more of them. You may have them to superfluity; even so you will want more. "Desires," said the great sage, Paramahansa Yogananda, 'if kept ever fed, are never satisfied.' The way out of them is not to increase or vary the outward fare, but to learn to find contentment within ourselves.

Even the search for more things has a spiritual origin. Instinctive in the very fact of living is a constant demand for expanding experience, for expanding identification with the world around us, with truth, with reality. It is the soul's longing, not merely to possess superficially, but to become everything."

Swami Kriyananda
Eastern Thoughts,
Western Thoughts

The dissatisfaction of many Americans, coupled with the constant longing for expanding experience, has resulted in the refocusing of attention from the external world to the internal world of one's being. Twentieth century America, embedded in a routine of life which is preoccupied with "progress," only recently has shown concern for the exploration of the individual in relationship to himself. An "underground war" quietly was fought for the recognition and acceptance of a new way of viewing the world. This new view is encompassed in humanistic psychology and is now being introduced into other disciplines. A description of the events and discussions surrounding the "underground war" will help establish the central focus of this paper.

Present Arms

Research in the field of Speech Communication continually has reflected a concern for the individual in his relation to others (i.e. qualities of a leader, credibility, degree of persuasiveness). The field of Psychology, has followed a similar path in its research. Psychology, from the early 1900's to the early 1950's underwent a period which Criswell (1974, 44) appropriately describes as the "dark ages of literalistic behaviorism--unable to accept or recognize the other dimensions of man."

A revolution in psychology began to take place in the 1950's led by such men as Carl Rogers, Rollo May, Abraham Maslow and others, in an effort to reestablish psychology as a holistic and scientific extension of philosophy concerning itself with all of life.

The advocates of an "underground war gained support in the 1950's and the number of followers sharing a concern for an expanded, holistic approach to psychology grew. Maslow's mailing list (1954) served to facilitate communication among like-minded investigators until the conception of the Journal of Humanistic Psychology by Anthony Sutich in 1957.

More and more people became dissatisfied with a methodology which concerned itself only with the external environment. The arguments of the behaviorists and the humanists were voiced and became the "weapons" of the underground war.

The War

The behaviorists and the humanists fought to distinguish their respective approaches from each other. Matson (1971, 8-9), claimed that the division between external and internal environment was marked by the differences in behaviorism (external) and psychoanalysis/humanism (internal). He declared: "Behaviorism placed all its stress upon the external environment (that is upon stimuli from the outer world as the controlling factor in behavior), psychoanalysis placed its emphasis upon the internal environment (upon stimuli from within, in the form of drives and instincts)."

Pervin (1970) identified the difference between (1) humanistic, man-centered, phenomenological and (2) scientific, pragmatic, empirical approaches in terms of their goals. He stated that the goal of the former is to achieve an understanding of the world as it is seen and experienced by the organism, not as defined by the researcher. The goal of the latter is empirical explanation which includes objectivity and standardization. Border (1974) carries this distinction one step further by stating that "the humanist is concerned more with the individual than with the masses." The goal of the humanist then, is to help each person experience his existence as real (Buhler and Allen, 1972).

Maslow, a pioneer of humanistic psychology, explained the reasons for the "war" with the behaviorists. He suggested that "humanistic psychology has risen in a struggle as a reaction against the limitations (as philosophy of human nature) of the two most comprehensive psychologies now available--behaviorism (or associationism) and classical Freudian psychoanalysis." (Maslow, 1971, 223).

Another claim of the humanist against behaviorism was explained by Borden (1974, 2): "The behavioral scientist has cast homosapiens into a model shaped according to the constructs of his research methodology rather than the likeness of the human being as he is able to be construed."

The Truce

The truce came after the realization that a purely descriptive behavioristic approach could no longer serve as the sole methodological approach. Abraham Maslow (1969) commenting on the effects of a strict behaviorism in psychology noted that "If the only tool you have is a hammer, you tend to treat everything as if it were a nail." The point was clear--the method cannot become the goal itself--for it will lead to a radical underestimation of the possibilities in research.

The truce brought with it the formation of 1961-63 of the American Association for Humanistic Psychology (now titled the Association for Humanistic Psychology). The growing interest in humanistic psychology was evidenced by the increase in membership of AHP to approximately 5,000, the formation of Division 32, Humanistic Psychology, in the American Psychological Association; and the expanding international activities of the AHP.

The terms of agreement of the truce were that behaviorists and humanists should work hand in hand. When used independently the methods of each present only part of the picture, uncover only part of the truth, and ultimately add only partial knowledge. When used together they serve to provide a balance for each other--to create a marriage between the scientific and the intuitive. Ornstein (1972, 162) comments: "There are two major ways in which men have approached knowledge about themselves and the nature of life. One, the scientific and logical employs the steady input and accumulation of information; the other, the intuitive attempts the development of another 'organ of perception' as the Sufis call it."

The Aftermath

The concern for the holistic approach spread to other fields. In Communication, books on small groups, interpersonal, and nonverbal communication began to include exercises and experiences to aid students in seeing and exploring themselves in different ways. For example, formats of several new

books (e.g., Barker, 1974) are designed specifically to help students "experience" what they read in order to more fully understand. Books written solely on communication games and exercises are designed to go beyond the traditional reading and lecture routine of the classroom.

This trend cannot be underestimated for it changes the very nature of learning and classroom instruction. Whereas learning has previously involved a transfer from the outer (external sources, lectures from the teacher, books) to the inner (cognitive and emotional make-up of the learner). This new approach emphasizes the reverse: inner awareness, experiencing and understanding as a prerequisite to digesting information in a valuable and meaningful way. Some teaching methods which incorporate this approach are discussed by Joyce and Weils in their book Models of Teaching. In their section on "Personal Sources" they describe the Rogerian non-directive teaching method, synectics, awareness training, and others.

The aftermath of this struggle has brought with it a need to redefine research. In doing so, the question which Humpty Dumpty raised should be kept in mind! "Who is to be the master, you or the word?" For those who claim that we cannot redefine words, let them consider this question seriously. Given the approach and concerns of the humanists, research is not limited to the rigid and rigorous scientific approach. Research in its newly defined form includes any method (intuitive or scientific) which serves to reveal the truth. This definition relocates the concern in research to the "product" as opposed to only the "means." In some of the most stringent, scientifically correct research we cannot help but note that spurious and insignificant results have been repeatedly produced. If all of humanistic approaches were to live or die based upon empirical proof, then they would die, and man would suffer a tremendous loss.

A research mode then, is considered "appropriate" when it is "appropriate to the subject or area which is being investigated.

The research in the area of personal growth fall naturally into four categories: 1) empirical, 2) case studies, 3) exploratory, and 4) descriptive. The measurement of inner learning and growth does not lend itself, in most cases, to the rigid scientific approach, hence the need for multiple approaches. The four types of research methods are discussed individually below.

Empirical. This approach is found predominantly in group research, where pre and posttest measures are employed. This term is used to describe both quantitative-descriptive and quantitative-experimental approaches.

Case Study. The case study usually involves the N=1 case. It is widely used in specialized approaches such as psychodrama. The N=1 case can be justified according to Duke (quoted by Buhler and Allen, 1972, 32-33). He states: "The intensive test of a theoretical proposition in an individual case, providing it is properly done, is far more rigorous and demand-

ing than the survey of a thousand people with questionnaires...Each individual, as an individual, contitutes one full and complete test of the universal proposition."

Exploratory. This approach is most commonly employed in the approaches listed under intrapersonal. It involves a discussion of theory, principles, or historical precedents in relation to a technique or approach which is being discussed. The technique or approach may or may not be new, but in many cases it is the "re-opening" of a field or an area.

Descriptive. For the purposes of this paper, this area includes survey research in addition to "how to do it" books which offer a "prescriptive" approach to growth techniques. Books on massage, various Eastern systems (such as yoga) or biofeedback, all explain to the learner how he can "grow." The learner then attempts to follow the instructions and become living "research" to himself insofar as he is able to attain the authors goals for their methods.

A few words of caution should precede the following review of the research in personal growth and communication behavior. Whatever people gain in group and individual experiences still seems somewhat tentative. Ruitenbeek (1970) explained that, in the therapeutic setting, psychotherapists by and large often have been reluctant to employ follow-up studies of their patients, hence follow-up studies are scarce or nonexistent. The methodological problems in group research are numerous and serve to send many potential researchers in the "other direction." Some of these problems include controls, temporal change in training outcomes, dimensions and directions of anticipated change (the variability of training experiences), timing of data collection, and effects on search efforts of the experimenter's common involvement in the laboratory setting (Harrison, 1967).

Another barrier, which precludes any summary statement about the status of the research in group work, is that the perspective of the researcher has undergone considerable change (Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1970). The early research with group approaches was buried in the "pure science" view, while more current research is rooted in "applied science." The difference is that the former focused on the processes of group development, as they interacted with characteristics of group members, and the latter was concerned with outcomes--the payoffs associated with specific internal group process such as attitudinal or behavioral change.

Even with the more current "applied" look at groups, opponents vigorously contend that the validity of the method has not been demonstrated, possible damages could be severe, and groups are a form of manipulation and an invasion of personal privacy. Such arguments are not without some basis, yet the voices of those who have undergone such group experiences and have told of their new awareness, their personal growth, cannot be easily ignored.

It apprears that an easily understandable phenomenon has occurred. Egan (1970, 3) summarized it as follows: "The practice of senstitivity training has simply outrun both organized research and theoretical formulation, and the resulting turmoil has made many behavioral scientists look upon the whole field of laboratory learning with suspicion and upon the subspeciality of sensitivity training with outright hostility."

With these words of cautin in mind, the various approaches to personal growth have been placed into three areas: 1) intrapersonal (techniques and methods which focus on the individual exclusively and do not require a group), 2) interpersonal (methods for self-exploration and interpersonal exploration where a group serves as the vehicle), and 3) nonverbal (a subset of both intrapersonal and interpersonal which focuses on awareness of one's physical self through touch and physical contact with others).

INTRAPERSONAL AWARENESS

"Basic to the entire art of communication is the individual's inherent need to understand himself and to communicate within himself. As he communicates within himself he is able to understand what he means, and from this basis he can interpret the events that occur about him. Consequently, he understands more fully the self-expressions of others and attempts to express himself more effectively. In the study of communication it is imperative that the individual first know his own basis of operation or his life orientation. As he understands himself and begins to understand the life orientations of others, he is then able to complete the communication cycle which brings about his desired response."

Wiseman and Barker
Speech/Interpersonal
Communication

As the basis for all other levels of communication, intrapersonal communication deserves considerable attention. Intrapersonal awareness may be defined as the focusing of man on his inner self. Unfortunately, it is this area, when viewed collectively, that is in its infancy in terms of empirical research. Empirical research has been conducted in dream analysis, hynagogic and hypnapomic states; hypnosis; meditation (use of biofeedback); psychedelics; sensory deprivation and body rhythm. On the other hand, methods relating to spiritual growth (such as Zen Buddhism) and exploration of the inner self (such as psychosynthesis) are lacking in an empirical approach. However, the underlying philosophy to these approaches is ancient and from this point of view, these areas could well be considered the "oldest" in terms of research since they have been "practiced" and "applied" for thousands of years.

The following discussion will focus on two areas which differ considerably in the research available on each. The first area will deal with psychosynthesis pioneered by Roberto Assagioli, and the second with biofeedback as a form of psychotechnology.

Psychosynthesis

Criswell (1974, 47) observes that, "a number of researchers in psychology have been meeting formally and informally for several years to pool their theoretical insights and research strategies toward a science of consciousness."

In the East, the terms "science of consciousness" and "research" have very different meanings from Western definitions. The Easterner would

ask a man from the West, "Why do you seek external proof for something that can only be proven within?" It is with this question in mind that we can examine the area of psychosynthesis and claim it to be valid even though there is little in the way of empirical research. However, we can offer the interested reader the case studies of Buddha, Jesus Christ, Krishna and others.

Psychosynthesis is considered by many to be the Western approach to Eastern thought. Its basic components include: 1) the concept that each individual is in constant development, actualizing successively many later potentialities; 2) the stressing of meaning -- particularly the meaning which each individual gives to life, or is looking for in life; 3) the recognition of the importance of values, particularly of the aesthetic, poetic, and religious values; 4) the focus on starting from within, of beginning with the self of the individual, with his presence; 5) the recognition of the depth and seriousness of human life, of the place of anxiety in it and of the suffering which has to be faced; 6) the emphasis on the future and its dynamic role in the present; and 7) the recognition of the uniqueness of each individual.

In sum, psychosynthesis may...be considered as the "individual expression of wider principle of a general law of inter-individual and cosmic synthesis" (Assagioli, 1965, 30).

Psychosynthesis parallels many other areas in terms of its approach and aim. Included among these are the various spiritual approaches from Buddhism to the Gurdjieffian Fourth Way. The research in all of these areas is predominantly in the descriptive and exploratory stages.

Biofeedback

"Our personal and scientific attention is being shifted inward, to the importance of consciousness itself as an object of inquiry, and to the self-control of internal states" (Ornstein, 1972, 184). Physiological feedback research, thus involves a fundamental redirection of technology toward the internal rather than external environment.

Research into brainwave feedback has been conducted with many subjects who are practioners of meditiation. Before reviewing the research, a brief comparison of the meditative and normal states would be helpful.

Ornstein (1972) describes one type of concentrative meditation which uses a "steady gaze" on either a natural object or a special constructed one -- a mandala. Under normal conditions our eyes move around and fixate at various points in large movements which are called "saccades." Even when we try to fix vision on a single object, very small involuntary movements, and different cells are stimulated from moment to moment.

Decreased visual attention to the external environment has been linked with the production of the alpha rhythm in the occipital cortex. Lehmann, Beeler, and Fender (1967) investigated the brain state evoked by the stabilized image. Employing the use of the electroencephalogram (EEG) they found that the alpha rhythm increases when the eyes are closed, or when the eyes are rolled up into the head cutting off vision. They concluded that uniform visual input created an alpha state. Tepas (1962), in a similar study, found that the alpha activity of the brain increased during the period of blank-out (no visual input).

Both research studies employed the effects of the stablilized image and the ganzfield (a completely patternless visual field) which are very similar to those of concentrative meditation. Other studies have indicated that "meditation" is also a high alpha state. These include Baghi and Wenger (1967); Anand et al. (1961); Kasamatsu and Hirai (1966); Akishige (1968); Wallace (1972).

The value of feedback lies in the theory that autonomic processes can be conditioned. K. M. Bykov and Gant (1957), after many years of research concluded: "The gap between the two disconnected worlds of psyche and soma is being bridged." The most sophisticated research in the voluntary alteration of physiological processes has been that of Miller (1969) and DiCara (1970). They both found that the alterations in blood flow, and in the activity of internal organs and of glands, can be brought about voluntarily by the type of learning that psychologists consider to be higher. Most important, their research demonstrates that learning can take place within the autonomic nervous system seemingly without the involvment of the voluntary skeletal musculature. Lang (1970) and Shapiro (1970) have found comparable findings.

Kasamatsu and Hirai (1966) found that EEG changes during Zen meditation indicate that the cortical excitatory level will be gradually lowered even by the "concentration" of the inner minds.

Anand, Chhing, and Singh (1961) studied four yogis who practiced samadhi. They investigated them electroencephalographically and observed that their "resting records" showed persistent alpha activity with increased amplitude modulation during samadhi. A second finding was that the alpha activity could not be blocked by various sensory stimuli during meditation. In testimony of this, Anand et al. (1961), had two yogis keep their hand immersed in ice cold water for 45-55 minutes. They both showed persistent alpha activity both before and during this practice.

The use of biofeedback equipment has aided practioners and researchers in assessing the "inner state" of an individual. Beyond this, findings have demonstrated that inner awareness, such as that found in meditation, is a strong and powerful state.

Summary. The two major techniques discussed in this section of the paper are representative of the research conducted in intrapersonal growth promoting communication behavior. The following chart summarizes some of the more commonly used intrapersonal growth promoting techniques.

INTRAPERSONAL AWARENESS

APPROACH	PIONEER(S)	DESCRIPTION
Biofeedback	Grey Walter	the use of various types of feedback (EEG, muscle tension, temperature) to control internal states.
Active Imagination	Carl Jung	a therapeutic approach for the reunification with the unconscious
Dialogue House	Ira Progoff	a center which follows Progoff's approach to myth, symbols and journal keeping.
Ways of the Oracle Astrology		use of astrology for self-exploration and development.
I Ching	Chinese System	the "Ancient Book of Changes" which can be used to explore one's being in the world.
Psychosynthesis	Roberto Assagioli	the synthesis of a number of psychological processes to move man toward his higher self.
Tarot		cards used for fortune telling.

INTRAPERSONAL AWARENESS (continued)

APPROACH	PIONEER(S)	DESCRIPTION
Optokinetic Training	Eleanor Criswell	the use of the Optokinetic Perceptual Learning Device (OPLD), "The Drum" for sensory stimulation and learning (increases speed and accuracy of performance).
Computer/man Interface	Dean Brown	attempts to link man with computer more effectively for learning, using an affective approach.
Multi-media		the use of sensory input from a number of sources in a synchronized effect.
Body Time and Rhythm	Gay Luce	a systematic system of charting and recording body and mind cycles in order to achieve more control over both.
Mind Games	Robert Masters Jean Houston	the use of techniques to produce altered states of consciousness for the purpose of bringing the individual to the realization that "man is not something we know has to be surpassed; rather man is still something to be realized."
Hypnosis	Anton Mesmer	the use of suggestion to control mind and body, can be used to promote relaxed bodily state.
Systematic Desensitization	James McCroskey et al.	use of a series of graduated repeated suggestions to relax the mind and body.

INTRAPERSONAL AWARENESS (continued)

APPROACH	PIONEER(S)	DESCRIPTION
Subud	Pak Subud of Indonesia	"the quiet way"
Zen Buddhism	Alan Watts and others	the Japanese approach to Buddhism which focuses on a way of being in everyday life.

INTERPERSONAL, SMALL GROUP AWARENESS

"Social life and communication are two words which imply sharing and participating, but the 1970's is witnessing the rise of existential loneliness, the increased use of the word alienation. As interaction decreases, as we find ourselves further and further apart, we become less than social, and human life becomes less than what it could be.

Our age, though, may be coming to realize the necessity for human contact. The rise of sensitivity groups, group marathons, human relations workshops, and the increased use of groups in academic and business settings, all provide evidence that the most efficient means for insuring survival is in human contact, face-to-face interaction; interpersonal communication."

Lawrence B. Rosenfeld,
Human Interaction in
the Small Group Setting, 1973.

The range of group experiences, both therapeutic and non-therapeutic, is diverse and continually expanding as is evidenced by the crowding of bookshelves with volumes such as The New Group Therapies, Growth Games, and Sensitivity Training and the Laboratory Approach. Group experiences, designed to facilitate emotional and social development, have become prominent in American life. Growth centers, humanistic schools and organizations such as the Easalen Institute, have drawn wide attention. The Association for Humanistic Psychology has become the growth center network while various other humanistic educational enterprises (which Maslow labeled the "eupsychian (good soul) network") provide the humanistic movement with support.

The group therapies, in a broad overview, are more similar than they are diverse. For this reason, it is reasonable to examine the research in two areas, basic encounter groups and psychodrama, in an attempt to locate the stage of research in group therapy in general. The basic encounter group research will be combined with T-group research, although some scholars would prefer to separate the two. Psychodrama deserves an independent review since it is a different, yet widely used approach in groups. Collectively, psychodrama, role-playing, encounter, and T-groups account for the largest amount of research conducted on group methods. Since several other papers presented previously in this symposium focused on therapeutic group techniques, they will be discussed only briefly here.

Basic Encounter Groups

The basic encounter group is generally called a T-group or lab group. The "T" stands for training laboratory in group dynamics workshops in human relationships and sensitivity training. The term "synanon" is used when dealing with drug addicts.

Sensitivity training, although a current phenomenon, has historical roots which can be traced back to 1914 and the early work of Jacob L. Moreno. As the father of the encounter movement, Moreno, in his publication in Vienna, provided the first literary definition of encounter when he described it as "a confrontation, a meeting of two individuals who try to see the world for a moment through the other's eyes, and to relate in the most meaningful sense through mutual understanding."

The encounter is an intensive group experience which has, to date, functioned in various settings including industries, universities, church groups and even in resort settings which provide a retreat from everyday life. The movement started in the National Training Laboratory in Bethel, Maine and spread to Idyllwild, California with groups existing in France, England, Holland, Austria, Japan and Australia.

The purpose of sensitivity training and group encounter is an attempt to explore group interaction on many levels--verbal, sensory, and physical. These techniques can be utilized as a model for dealing with various forms of interpersonal relations, from ongoing social issues to the isolation, alienation and distrust felt by members of a group. (Siroka, 1971).

Current research in the area of encounter groups is divided into 3 areas: 1) the effects on individual growth, 2) the effects on general improvement of participant capabilities, and 3) the effects of on-the-job behavors.

The Effects on Individual Growth. There is confusing evidence related to the individual growth of a person participating in a group experience. On the positive side much of the research indicates that the individual has a much better awareness of himself, greater self-satisfaction, and self-esteem, after a group experience. Clarke (1970, 116) cites two studies that show substantial "personal growth" resulting from T-groups designed for business and professional people. Harrison and Oshry (1966) report that participants in the N.T.L. showed a significant increase in awareness of the availability of human resources (self and others). Burke and Bennis (1961) conducted an analysis of the perceptual transitions of 84 T-group members incurred during training. Pre-post test measurements revealed that satistically significant perceptual changes took place. They concluded that during the course of the training experienced members became more satisfied in their "perception of self" and "moved their actual perceptions in the direction of their ideal." Significant findings, supporting the concept that T-groups aid in self-awareness and self-satisfaction

have been reported by several investigators. Moscovic (1972) indicated that self-role perceptions are more stable; Bebout and Gordon (1972) discovered increases in levels of self-esteem, self-reliance, and self-satisfaction; Lieberman (1972) found increased self-satisfaction; Hampden and Turner (1970) in a review of three separate studies, found self-awareness to increase after participation in T-groups.

There is also a substantial amount of post-training testimony and research, which confuses the issue of personal growth. The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior (1960) conducted a post-training opinion survey which revealed that two-thirds of the participants viewed the T-group program as slightly more helpful than useless and one-third viewed the program as helpful. Participants saw themselves changing in seven or eight dimensions of behavior. Approximately half the changes were thought to be positive and half of the changes were perceived as negative.

In a 1965 study, Klaw noted that, although a majority of people who return from laboratory training report they have been changed for the better, some participants return liking themselves less and not knowing what to do about it. He cited a post-training survey of more than 100 graduates of a laboratory sponsored by Western Training Laboratories, that revealed that one graduate in ten felt this way. Klaw quotes on participant as saying after the training session, "I seemed to have lost all positive aspects of my self-concept. I realized that I had built up concepts about myself that were untenable, but I had not gained anything to replace them."

Another important area of concern deals with the casulaty rate (subjects who experienced prolonged psychological distress as a result of encounter training) of participants. The often echoed cry of the critics of group experiences is that they produce serious psychological harm. Again, findings in this area are inconsistent. Lieberman et al. (1973), in a conservative estimate, found a casulaty rate of 9% of the 179 persons who completed encounters. Argyris (1962) indicated that in the T-groups conducted by the N.T.L., there have been only four "nervous breakdowns" among 10,000 students and "all of these people had previous psychiatric histories." Klaw (1965) cited a post-training survey in which 10% of the participants felt a loss in self-esteem as a result of their T-group experience. A review by Reddy (1972) of six major studies revealed that severe problems such as psychosis, or mental problems, that forced a participant to leave the group occurred in only 0 to 5% of 14,200 N.T.L. participants. As these studies indicate, research in the area of individual growth is far from conclusive.

The Effects on General Improvement of Participant Capabilities.

Miles (1965) reported a content analysis of self and associate reported changes after T-group training. He found that participants had developed 1) increased sensitivity to others 2) greater equalitarian attitudes, and 3) more effective skills of communication and leadership coupled with group task and maintenance functions.

Stock (in Bradford et al., 1964) cited studies by Gildwell and by Miles, Colten and Whitman based on participant responses that reflect desired individual learning. Gildwell found that 71% of the members changed their self-perceptions in the direction of greater involvement and greater concern about developing skill and awareness in interpersonal relations. Sixty-seven percent increased their belief that the ability to give service to others is a crucial factor in problem solving and 42% gained constructive change concerning the interrelationships between themselves and others in problem-solving behavior.

Many positive aspects of interpersonal relations have been reported. Some of these include: greater tolerance and open-mindedness (Bunker, 1965; Bradford, 1964; and Haiman, 1963); increased frankness in interpersonal relations (Bradford et al., 1964); reduction in manifest anxiety (Bunker, 1965); reduced alienation (Bebout and Gordon, 1972, 101); increased social perceptiveness (Gibbs, 1972); increased sensitivity to others (Miles, Colten and Whitman in Bradford et al., 1964); increased congruency in their perceptions of others, participants came to see others as the other individuals see themselves (Burke and Bennis, 1961).

Conflicting findings temper the positive results of many of the previously noted studies. In a study by Deep, Bass, and Vaughn (1967) T-groups, after the sessions had been completed, were recombined by 1) separating people who had previously been involved in T-groups together and 2) keeping people together who had been through T-groups. The experiment involved participation in a business game in a course of decision-making. Results indicated that recombined groups performed more effectively in the decision-making exercise than did that intact T-groups, although there was less internal conflict in the latter. According to this study, it appears that increased interpersonal skills cannot be transferred effectively to a problem-solving situation.

Goldman and Brodry (1970) refute the claims that encounter groups aid in increased interpersonal awareness and the resolution of personal problems. In a review of impressions gained from a group encounter experience (generalizing them to other situations) they concluded that 1) encounter groups appear to be rather ad hoc without substantial points of contact with adequate and realistic therapeutic problems, and 2) they offer little in the way of substantive contribution to personal problems.

The Effects on On-the-Job Behaviors (long-range assessment).

The important question related to the findings reported to this point is "How significant are the findings or behavioral changes in individuals over time?" Lieberman et al., (1972) reported that the amount of improvement decreased over time. Immediately after T-group experiences the ratio of high to low evaluations was 4.75 to 1 while after six months it had declined to 2.33 to 1. Luke (1970) reported a study by Stephenson et al., which found similar results. While the results of a six month posttest still showed improvement, the six month attitude measures were more comparable to attitudes before training.

Evidence of a similar fade-out is provided by Bennis (1963). The consistent findings seem to be that group participants are less enthusiastic over group experiences after a certain time lapse (i.e. 6 months after the time of training).

In a final analysis, Kurt Back (1972) summarized the view of encounter groups as "not encouraging." He further identified the limitations of encounter in his article appropriately titled, "The Group Can Comfort But It Can't Cure."

Psychodrama

Psychodrama is credited to Moreno and is defined as "the science which explores truth by dramatic methods" (Moreno, 1969, 13). Psychodrama primarily uses five instruments--the stage, the subject or patient, the director, the staff or therapeutic aides (termed "auxiliary egos") and the audience. In psychodrama, one individual is representative of the group in an exploration of his life, undertaken with the help of a director and group members. Pyschodrama uses verbal and nonverbal techniques to explore and develop the emotional interaction with the group.

Psychodrama creates self encounter and self-other awareness on a variety of levels. In its fullest sense, as a method of psychotherapy, it is designed to help an individual explore himself, encounter himself in the past, present and future, yet all in the here and now.

The theory behind pyschodrama is based on the premise that promoting attitude change (or insight into a personal problem) requires that the person participate actively in the proceedings. Frank (1970) cites a study by Rosenberg (1956) in which he compared the effects on attitude change of playing roles and of observing others play the roles. The findings indicated that if a student assumed the role of a person with whom he disagreed, he was more likely to change his opinion to conform to that person's views than if he tried to identify with or merely observed someone else playing the role.

Similar finding were reported by Kelman (1953); King and Janis (1956); Mouton et al., (1955-56); Janis and King (1954). The explanation behind these findings is provided by Festinger (1953). When a person role-plays, he thinks up "exactly the kinds of arguments, illustrations and motivating appeals that he regards as most convincing...(he) ...is induced to hand-tailor the content so as to take account of the unique motives and predispositions of one particular person--namely himself."

In a more recent set of studies Janis and Mann (1965) studied the effectiveness of emotional role-playing in modifying smoking habits and attitudes. Following the role-playing, patients reported a significant decrease in the number of cigarettes smoked daily. In a follow-up study,

Mann and Janis (1968) interviewed the subjects 8 months later and then another 18 months later. In both interview role-players reported significantly lower daily consuption of cigarettes.

In a different type of role-playing situation, Mann (1967) tested the effects of three role-playing conditions--fear, shame, and a cognitive situation. Results indicated that the fear role-playing experience produced greater change in smoking attitudes than did cognitive role-playing. The fear and shame conditions did not differ significantly.

A study by Keutzer, Lichtenstein and Himes (1969) found no persuasive effect among the role-playing subjects. The authors commented, however, that subjects were aware of the health peril associated with smoking and in the study by Janis and Mann they were not. It was concluded that, since the Surgeon General's report was released prior to the Keutzer et al. study and people continued to smoke even though they were given a strong warning, it was highly unlikely that any persuasive technique could have changed their behavior.

The most convincing research in psychodrama, however, is found in case studies. The reason for examining case studies is that in reality, the role-playing or psychodramatic situation cannot be reproduced in the laboratory. Psychodrama is a personalized experience based upon the subject's involvement in a personal situation or problem. This complicates, and in some cases precludes a laboratory approach since subjects do not share the same personal problems with the same degree of intensity. In such cases, therapeutic situations and reports by the therapists and patients provide much more valid evidence than contrived laboratory studies. The following three case studies are reported by Moreno (1957) and Drew (1957).

Case 1.

A girl, Marianne, of 23 was in love with a young man. Unfortunately her parents had aranged a marriage for her and refused even to meet her young man. The psychodrama situation was performed over national television in France. In the first role-playing situation Marianne asks her parents if she can bring Jacques, her boyfriend, in the house to meet them. Her father immediately refuses and replies that he has already chosen a husband for her and "the whole thing is finished." The first role-playing situation was based on exactly what had already happened with Marianne and her partents.

In the second role-playing situation, instead of giving in, Marianne maintains the position that she loves Jacques and that he is the only one she loves and cannot accept the other. When the second situation was enacted, Marianne broke into tears and her parents met Jacques and they were engaged.

Eventually this produced positive results for Marianne because her parents saw the show on TV. Her father asked her why she didn't tell them about

her feelings and she replied that she didn't know herself. The role-playing situations allowed Marianne to experience what she was really feeling.

Case 2.

In a second case, a patient announced to the group that her husband had died and then burst into tears. The details of her trauma revealed that he had died and been buried while she was away. It all happened too suddenly for her.

The psychodrama was set up so that every scence leading from the coronary attack to the funeral was enacted. In other words, things which the wife had never gone through, she could now visualize.

The psychodrama "brought her back to realizing herself and feeling herself as a wife of this man whom she loved so much."

Case 3.

A women, at the age of 28, married a man 27 years her senior. Because he was infertile she had artificial insemination. Her husband, after the baby was born began to show signs of disinterest in both his wife and the child. When the baby was two years old he divorced her. She had a conflict in dealing with the child and her feeling was rooted in social ostracism. In psychodrama a situation was enacted which allowed her to express her feelings and attitudes for two uninterrupted hours. She experienced a "great sense of relief."

Since this experience, Dr. Drew reports that "the patient has been making a gradual progressive recovery and she is no longer ashamed of her son being an artificial insemination baby."

Both Moreno and Drew note that its difficult, if not impossible, through words alone to explain what transpires during a psychodramatic session. The point seems clear enough, however, that psychodrama is a promising means of investigating the personalities involved in a group and aiding the individual in his own personal insight and growth.

Summary

The research reported in this section of the paper, obviously only "scratches" the surface. The number of techniques and methods which have been developed and tested are numerous. The following chart will help summarize some of the major techniques and training programs in interpersonal growth promoting communication behavior.

INTERPERSONAL AWARENESS

APPROACH	PIONEER(S)	DESCRIPTION
Basic Encounter	Carl Rogers Jacob Moreno	an intensive group experience designed to explore oneself and interpersonal relations within the group process.
T-groups	Kurt Lewin	the basic educational instrument of the N.T.L., Bethel, Maine in which the group struggles to create a meaningful structure for itself out of a largely unstructured situation. T-groups were designed to allow participants to be involved in the very group processes they were studying.
Open Encounter	William Schutz	the use of sensory awareness techniques and special encounter principles.
Gestalt Therapy	Fritz Perls	a therapeutic approach which stresses the here-and-now situation and encourages the element of confrontation.
Human Potential Groups	Herbert Otto	the use of human potential techniques in a group setting.
Marathon	George Bach Fred Stoller Bill Schutz Elizabeth Mintz	an intensification and acceleration of transparency and genuine encounter through extended group interaction (e.g., 24 hour stints without a break).

INTERPERSONAL AWARENESS (continued)

APPROACH	PIONEER(S)	DESCRIPTION
Theater Games		the use of the theater to explore contemporary social issues.
Psychodrama	Jacob Moreno	a method for exploring oneself in a group situation through the use of role-playing techniques.
Transactional Therapy	Eric Berne	a structural and transactional analysis of "the games people play."
Theme-centered Groups	Ruth Cohn	techniques for concentrating on thought about a given theme, concentrating on feelings and experiences of being silent in a group. This technique is a part of group therapy and is based on the principles of psychoanalysis.

NONVERBAL AWARENESS

"...analysis of interpersonal communication is incomplete without a consideration of more than the mere use of language...to study communication is to examine all the ways in which human beings send information and integrate their actions and feelings."

Eisenberg and Smith
Nonverbal Communication

"Tactile communication is probably the most basic or primitive form of communication. In fact, tactual sensitivity may be the first sensory process to become functional. In fetel life, the child begins to respond to vibrations of the mother's pulsating heart beat which impinge on his entire body and are magnified by amniotic fluid. In one sense, our first input about what 'life' is going to be like comes from the sense of touch."

Mark L. Knapp
Nonverbal Communication
In Human Interaction

Although the term "nonverbal" covers a variety of subareas (i.e., kinesics, proxemics, paralanguage, chronemics. etc.) it will be used in this case to refer to touching behavior and sensory awareness.

There are a variety of systems available to allow a person to become more aware of his body, to relax more effectively, and to mobilize body energies. There are other systems which teach the individual a new "sensory awareness" so that he can be more in touch with himself, others, and the world around him. A philosopher and author of Bodies in Revolt, Thomas Hanna, has proposed a new field for exploration of the unified body/mind called "somatology". The techniques involve movement toward a re-unification of mind and body, the whole person. This was pioneered by Wilhelm Reich (1967) and Alexander Lowen (1966) who explored the relationship between body and mind in contemporary psychotherapy.

Reich began in the 1920's and reached the conclusion that disturbances in psychological character and peculiarities of muscular posture serve the same function: each tend to divert or economize psychic energy; muscular tension and emotional blocks were equivalent. The psychotherapist could legitimately attack either, as a means toward learning about the patient's problems and helping to resolve them.

Alexander Lowen (1969) saw the relaionship between the body and the mind to be inseparable. He states, "...the body is the person, the person his body. We have no real existence apart from our bodies. What goes on in our minds is basically a reflection of what goes on in our bodies."

Related to the unification of body and mind or the removal of the taboo against the body is the research on touch deprivation. The relevance of examining this research is evident since it shifts the emphasis from "Should we touch?" to "What happens when we are deprived of touch?" The following pages will examine the research in this area, followed with a discussion of several approaches involving the use of touch.

Touch Deprivation

Most of what we know about the functions of the skin has been learned since the 1940's. For a long period of time this area of study was neglected and it has only recently been recognized that "as a sensory system the skin is much the most important organ system of the body" (Montagu, 1971, 7).

The continuous stimulation of the skin by the external environment serves to maintain both sensory and motor tonus. As a result, the brain must receive sensory feedback from the skin in order to make such adjustments as may be called for in response to the information it receives.

There are two questions which are important when examining the research related to touch. Montagu (1971, 12) raises both of them as follows: 1) What kind of skin stimulations are necessary for the healthy development of the organism, both physically and behaviorally? 2) What are the effects, if any, of the want or insufficiency of particular kinds of skin stimulation?

During the nineteenth century more than half the infants died in their first year of life, from a disease call marasmus, a Greek work meaning "wasting away." During the second decade of the twentieth century the death rate for infants under one year of age in various foundling institutions in the U.S. was close to 100 percent. Dr. Henry Dwight Chapin (1915) introduced the idea of boarding out babies instead of leaving them in institutions. Dr. Fritz Talbot (1941) introduced the idea of "tender, loving care," recognizing the necessity for touch and human contact in infants.

Dr. J. Brennemann (1932) reported that the mortality rates for infants under one year fell from 35 percent to less than 10 percent, after the establishment of the rule that every baby should be picked up and "mothered" several times a day.

In a study by Dr. William Greene (1958), he found that a large proportion of a group of patients suffering diseases of the lymphatic and blood vessels, had developed their illness following a loss, usually of the mother or mother substitute. Other investigators (Freedman et al., 1960; Sokoloff et al., 1969; Hasselemeyer, 1964; Mason, 1968) have discovered that the lack of tactile stimulation may contribute to later impairment of the infant.

Montagu (1971, 335) after reviewing countless studies, explained the importance of touch when he concluded:

"Tactile sensations become tactile perceptions according to the meanings with which they have been invested by experience. When affection and involvement are conveyed through touch, it is those meanings as well as the security--giving satisfaction, with which touch will become associated. Inadequate tactile experience will result in a lack of such associations and a consequent inability to relate to others in many fundamental human ways. Hence, the human significance of touching."

Marathon/encounter

As was noted in several previous papers the use of physical contact in various types of group approaches is becoming increasingly popular as well as successful. In an extreme case (that of nudity) Bindrin (1969) reported great success with openess and physical contact of participants in a nude marathon. He hypothesized that nudity might hasten the process of becoming emotionally open. He conducted a nude marathon encounter weekend and found improved self-confidence and acceptance of others. On the basis of 38 nude marathons he strongly suggests that "controlled skin contact" might be therapeutic in and of itself.

William Schutz (1969) in his book Joy makes a convincing case for the use of "physical release" in group sessions. He cites several case studies in which the individual was emotionally immobilized. In these cases physical mobilization allowed the individual the opportunity to break what he feels are unbreakable bonds. Schutz states, "when the body activities are successful, they lead to a feeling of more freedom and an increase in the concept of the self as a capable person, both essential ingredients of joy." (Schutz, 1969, 55).

Sensory Awakening.

Sensory awakening, developed by Bernard Gunther (1968) is a technique of increasing bodily awareness of sensory input. Gunther describes sensory awakening as "a method which can help bring you back to your senses: to quiet excessive thought, to release chronic tension, to enhance direct sensory-reality in the here and now. This process can show you how to allow greater sensitivity, feeling and awareness: aid you in letting yourself be more--your entire organism--open to the potentialities and possibilities with out/in you."

In his two popular books Sensory Relaxation and What to Do Till the Messiah Comes, Gunther provides many exercises and experiences for personal growth. Some of these include: 1) exploration of your own body (light slapping and tapping motions on legs, arms, and head to feel and come in contact with your skin), 2) breathing (special breathing exercises to focus your awareness on the internal processes involved), 3) attention to the here and

now (techniques to become more conscious of what one is doing in the present such as "smoking a cigarette" or "eating an orange") 4) energy flows (techniques for experiencing the flow of energy in your body).

An area which Gunther particularly emphasizes is group touching experiences. His satisfaction with the use of this method is evidenced in an excerpt from his book Sensory Awakening (1968, 111):

> Touch and pleasure
> can be sensuous
> without being sexual.
> There is a great amount
> of communication, caring,
> close openess
> which can come
> in mutual sensory interaction;
> satisfaction.

Bio-energetic Analysis.

Alexander Lowen (1966) has argued that the body has one fundamental energy, bioenergy, which is manifested by emotions and muscles alike. Every neurotic problem has its bodily counterpart. From this principle, bioenergetic therapy was developed. This therapy is an approach to the problems of the human personality through the direct involvement of the body in the psychoanalytic process.

Ruitenbeek (1970, 154) described the involvement of the body in this group approach. He stated that the body is involved in three ways. First, it is sufficiently exposed to be available for the interpretation of its expression and the analysis of its form and movement (in the psychoanalytic situation, men wear trunks and women wear leotards or other suitable apparel). Secondly, the body's energy processes are mobilized through breathing and movement to facilitate the expression of feeling and a setting is provided for the release of the repressed feelings that become activated in the course of this mobilization. Finally, the physical work with the body allows direct physical contact between participant and therapist.

Lowen (1969) cited several case studies in which a group member, through a phsycial expression, such as beating a bed with a tennis racket, opened up to themselves and problems that they were hiding from.

In conclusion, Ruitenbeek (1970, 165) stated that "in the encounter of human beings, who for some reason or another are brought together to look for answers and insights, nothing can be ignored in reaching such goals...a real existential encounter has to include the possibility of touch and the growing realization that no separation between the body and mind is possible.

Massage.

The art of massage has flooded the country as packages with special massage oils and instructions on "how to do it" fill the stores. Behind all this popularization of massage, however, is the fact that massage techniques are becoming of more interest to the therapist, and are currently being used in hospitals. However, aside from the testimony of the practioner and receiver of massage, studies are almost nonexistent. The following will therefore focus on the testimony of the usefulness of massage.

Downing (1972, 1) claimed that "the core of massage lies in its unique way of communication without words...massage can transpose a message into a new and different key. When receiving a good massage, a person usually falls into a mental-phsycial state difficult to describe. It is like entering a special room until now locked and hidden away; a room for daily meditation."

Oriental massage is an even more specialized technique which requires the masseur to understand the theory of nerve nodules. Serizawa (1972) in his book of oriental massage, describes its development. He comments that "the amma massage grew from the simple habit of pressing or rubbing numbed or chilled hands and feet with the fingers and palms of the hands. After many long years of practical experience with these treatments, the Chinese people learned the spots on the body where acupuncture, moxa and massage produced the maximum effect. Serizawa's book, Massage--The Oriental Method (1972), is dedicated to the treatment of common disorders (such as a toothache, asthma, menstrual irregularity, chronic gastritis, high and low blood pressure, poor hearing, and colds) through massage. The technique, which is ancient and highly specialized, aids in healing the individual through contact with tsubo or the vital points of one's body.

Summary

Because nonverbal communication growth promoting behavior is such a wide and varied area, it would be impossible to cite and discuss all of the existing research adequately in a few pages. The following chart, however, provides a basic overview of some of the major techniques and methods employed in nonverbal growth promoting behavior.

NONVERBAL AWARENESS

APPROACH	PIONEER(S)	DESCRIPTION
Somatology	Thomas Hanna	A discipline focusing on the exploration of the unified body/mind, the whole person.
Aikido		teaches direction and control of energy through concentration and directed movement.
Autogenic Training	Johannes Schultz	systematic training in relaxation.
Bio-energetic Analysis	Wilhelm Reich Alexander Lowen	an approach to the problems of the human personality through the direct involvement of the body in the psychanalytic process.
Breathing Therapy	Magda Proskauer	a directed exploration of breathing.
Feldenkrais Exercises	Moshe Feldenkrais	a collection of 1,400 exercises for focusing awareness through movement.
Progressive Relaxation	Jacobson	a relaxation technique.
Sensory Awakening	Bernard Gunther	techniques for increasing awareness of sensory input.

NONVERBAL AWARENESS (continued)

APPROACH	PIONEER(S)	DESCRIPTION
Sensory Awareness	Charlotte Selver Charles Brooks	a collection of meditative awareness experiences.
Structural Integration or Rolfing	Ida Rolf	a body manipulation system for re-aligning the body relative to gravity.
Tai Chi Chuan	Chinese System	a system for energizing and stimulating the body through flowing movements.
Massage	George Dowing	the use of rubbing, patting, slapping and systematic touch to relax muscles.

RESEARCH PROBLEMS AND DIRECTIONS IN GROWTH PROMOTING COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR

The preceding sections of this paper have focused primarily on existing research (or lack thereof) in the area of personal growth through communication behavior. At this point it seems reasonable to examine some directions for future research and some accompanying research problems in this area. The following discussion of research directions and problems, hopefully, will stimulate discussion and critical evaluation among researchers and potential researchers concerned with growth promoting communication behavior.

Perhaps the primary problem in conducting research in a primarily humanistic area, such as personal growth, is the lack of "hard" criterion measures which can be verified objectively. Because most criteria for evaluating personal growth are subjective, (i.e., based on observations by a trained evaluator or self reports by participants), validity and reliability of the measures often can be challenged. A search for more refined measurement instruments must be continued by both behavioral scientists and humanistic scholars in order to provide a more objective basis for evaluating the effects of various growth promoting techniques on human beings.

Several recent breakthroughs have been made in the development of objective measuring instruments, particularly in the area of nonverbal communication. For example, Paul Ekman (see Emmert and Brooks, 1970), at the Langley-Porter Institute in California, has developed a spohisticated computerized system for recording and analyzing nonverbal behaviors in the clinical setting. When similar advancements have been made by researchers in other phases of personal growth research, the task of quantifying and evaluating the growth and training programs will be facilitated substantially.

Similar to the concern for developing more valid criterion measures is the problem of establishing baseline data for subjects involved in personal growth training programs. Many of the studies cited previously in this paper relied solely on post training reports, and did not take into account the amount of relative growth participants brought into the program with them. In the future, perhaps questionnaires or scheduled interviews could be employed more extensively to help participants establish their own growth objectives PRIOR to the training program. These personal objectives could then be used as one measure of the success of growth for that individual. Obviously, the objectives of the researchers and trainers also must be included when evaluating the success of the program; but a combination of participants' and researchers' evaluations might lead to a more stable index of success (or failure) of a particular training program.

Because personal growth often emerges slowly, it is evident that laboratory research probably will not measure adequately long term effects of training. Consequently, longitudinal research and field studies will need to be

emphasized in order to provide more valid information about long term effects of training programs. McGrath and Altman (1967) indicate that longitudinal studies are not popular among researchers because of the delay in obtaining data for publication. Researchers involved in the concept of personal growth, however, probably have somewhat different views concerning the need to rush into print from their colleagues with more traditional scientific attitudes. The point cannot be ignored, however, that the extrinsic rewards of promotion, tenure and salary increases are slower for researchers who conduct longitudinal studies because their publications are delayed for long periods of time. It will take a modified view on the part of university administrations, legislatures, boards of trustees and promotion-tenure committees if long-term humanistic research is to be rewarded similarly to short-term laboratory research.

Perhaps the most promising technological advance which holds promise for personal growth-communication research is in the area of biofeedback devices. It is evident that much of the future research in personal growth will rely on biofeedback devices both for training and evaluation purposes. The present drawbacks in using biofeedback equipment (e.g., use of diodes, headbands, difficulty in calibration, reliability of inexpensive training units, etc.) will, in all probability be overcome as research in the area increases. The price of quality research units has already dropped substantially in the past two years as a function of their increased use in research. Thus, biofeedback units, perhaps, will point a new direction for researchers in the development of relaxed body and mind states and their measurement.

Social acceptability of nonverbal innovative growth techniques such as touching exercises and nude marathons will probably never be gained in the next several decades. Researchers employing these and similar techniques will need to be more sensitive to public stereotypes and adapt their techniques and the labels they use to describe them more effectively than they have done in the past in order to avoid "automatic" public rejection and criticism. One example of this point concerns the semantic difference between the terms "touch behavior" and "touchy-feely." Both terms are used occasionally by different researchers and their critics to describe the same technique or phenomenon. If researchers can apply their knowledge of general semantics and psychology to their audiences, perhaps even socially sensitive innovative techniques may have a greater change of gaining public acceptance.

Specific techniques and areas in which research in growth promoting communication behavior need to be conducted include:

(1) nonverbal behaviors in the marriage/courtship relationship

(2) nonverbal behaviors in the job/employment interview

(3) organizational interaction patterns and social development

(4) educational classroom interactions and social development

(5) local, city, state, and national governmental relationships with citizens on a personal/social level

(6) social ineraction between experimenters and subjects

(7) influence of the mass media on sterotypes of social interaction patterns

(8) mobility patterns and social development

(9) multiple correlation/regression studies of variables contributing to personal growth via communication

(10) instrumentation and criterion development of unobtrusive measures to measure personal growth.

In summary, the area of personal growth promoting communication behavior suffers from many of the problems of an emerging field or discipline. Though a considerable amount of research has been conducted, the field is literally wide open for refined research and development of training techniques. If the problems of developing adequate instrumentation, techniques, and evaluation measures can be overcome, the area of personal growth research can become one of the next frontiers for the field of communication.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akishige, Y. Psychological studies on Zen. Bulletin of the Faculty of Literature, Kyushu University, Japan, No. V (1968).

Anand, B., Chhina, G., & Singh, B. Some aspects of electroencephalographic studies in yogis. Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology, 1961, 13, 452-456. Reprinted in Tart, Altered States of Consciousness.

Argyris, C. Interpersonal competence and organizational behavior. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. IRwin, 1962.

Assagioli, R. Psychosynthesis, a manual of principles and techniques. New York: The Viking Press, 1965.

Back, K. W. The group can comfort but it can't cure. Psychology Today, 1972, 28-41.

Bagchi, B., & Wenger, M. Electrophysiological correlates on some yogic exercises. Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology, 1957, suppl. no. 7, 132-149.

Bebout, J., & Gordon, B., The value of encounter. In L. N. Solomon & B. Berzon (Eds.) New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972, 83-118.

Bennis, W. G. Goals and meta-goals of laboratory training. In R. T. Golembrenski & A. Blumberg (Eds.) Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1970, 14-18.

Bindrin, P. Nudity as a quick grab for intimacy in group therapy. Psychology Today, 1969, 3 (1), 24-28.

Borden, G. A. The humanistic approach to research in human communication. Paper presented at the Southern Speech Communication Association Convention, Richmond, Virginia, April, 1974.

Bradford, C. P., Bibb, J. R., & Benre, K. D. (Eds.) T-group theory and laboratory methods: Innovation in re-education. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Brennemann, J. The infant ward. American Journal of Diseases of Children, 1932, 43.

Buhler, C., & Allen, M. Introduction to humanistic psychology. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1972.

Bunker, D. R. Individual applications of laboratory training. Journal of Applied Science, 1965, April-May-June, I, 131-148.

Burke, H. L, & Bennis, W. G. Changes in perception of self and others during human relations training. Human Relations, 1961, XIV, 165-182.

Bykov, K. M, & Gantt, W. H. The cerebral cortex and the internal organs. New York: Chemical Publishing Co., 1957.

Chapin, H. D. A plea for accurate statistics in children's institutions. Transactions of the American Pediatric Society, 1915, 27.

Clark, J. V. Authentic interaction and personal growth in sensitivity groups. In R. T. Golembiewski & A. Blumberg (Eds.) Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers Inc., 1970, 116-129.

Criswell, E. Humanistic psychology: avenues to the psychic. Psychic, April 1974, 44-49.

Deep, S. P., Bass, B. M., & Vaughn, J. A. Some effects on business gaming of previous quasi-T-group affiliations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51 (5), 426-431.

DiCara, L. V. Learning in the autonomic nervous system. Scientific American, January 1970, 30-39. Offprint no. 525 reprinted in R. Ornstein, (Ed.) The nature of human consciousness. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co.; New York: The Viking Press, 1973.

Downing, G. The massage book. New York: Random House, 1972.

Drew, R. in J. E. Fairchild (Ed.) Personal problems and psychological frontiers. New York: Sheridan House, 1957, 276-285.

Egan, G. Encounter: group processes for interpersonal growth. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Inc., 1970.

Eisenberg, A. M., & Smith, R. R., Jr. Nonverbal communication. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1971.

Emmert, P., & Brooks, W. D. (Eds.) Methods of research in communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970.

Festinger, L. Cited in Houland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. Communication and persuasion: Psychological studies of opinion change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Foundation for research on human behavior. An action research program for organization improvement. Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1960.

Frank, J. D. Persuasion and healing: a comparative study of psychotherapy. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Freedman, D. G., Bovelman, H., & Freedman, N. Effects of kinesthetic stimulation on weight gain and smiling in premature infants. Cited by A. Montagu Touching. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Gibb, J. R. Meaning of the small group experience. In L. N. Solomon and B. Berson (Eds.) New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972, 1-12.

Golembiewski, R. T., & Blumberg, A. Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach. Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Goldman, G. D., & Brodig, H. M. An analytic and a behavioristic view of an encounter weekend. Group Process, 1970, 3(1), 101-121.

Greene, W. J., Jr. Early objects relations, somatic affective, and personal. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1958, 126, 225-53.

Gunther, B. What to do till the messiah comes. New York: Collier Books, 1971.

Gunther, B. Sense relaxation. New York: Collier Books, 1968.

Halman, F. S. Effects of training in group processes on open-mindedness. Journal of Communication, 1963, XIII, 236-245.

Hampden-Turner, C. M. An existential 'learning theory' and the integration of T-group research. In R. T. Golembiewski & A. Blumberg (Eds.) Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers Inc., 1970, 39-54.

Hanna, T. Bodies in revolt. Cited by Criswell, E. Humanistic psychology: avenues to the psychic. Psychic, April 1974, 44-49.

Harrison, R. Problems in the design and interpretation of research on human relations training. Exploration in Human Relations Training and Research, 1967, No. 1, Washington, D. C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Harrison, R., & Oshry, B. Transfer from here and now to there and then: changes in organizational problem diagnosis stemming from T-group training. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, II.

Hasselmeyer, E. G. The premature neonate's response to handling. Journal of the American Nurses Association, 1964, 2, 14-15.

Janis, I. L., & Mann, L. Effectiveness of emotional role-playing in modifying smoking habits and attitudes. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1965, 1, 84-90.

Joyce, B., & Weils, M. Models of teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Kasamatsu, A., & Kirai, T. An electroencephalographic study of Zen meditation (Zazew). Folia Psychiatria Et Neurologia Japonica, 1966, 20, 315-336. Reprinted in Tart, Altered states of consciousness.

Kelman, H. C. Attitude change as a function of response restriction. Human Relations, 6, 185-214.

Keutzer, C. S., Lichtenstein, E., & Himes, K. H. Emotional role-playing and changes in smoking attitudes and behavior. Proceedings, 77th Annual Convention, APA, 1969, 373-374.

King, B., & Janis, I. Comparison of the effectiveness of improvised versus non-improvised role-playing in producing opinion changes. Human Relations, 1956, 9, 177-186.

Klaw, S. Inside a T-group. Think, November-December, 1965, 31, 26-30.

Knapp, M. L. Nonverbal communication in human interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Lang, P. J. Autonomic control or learning to play the internal organs. Reprinted in T. Barber et al., (Eds.) Biofeedback and self-control. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971.

Lehmann, D., Beeler, G. W., & Fender, D. H. EEG responses during the observation of stabilized and normal retinal images. Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology, 1967, 22, 136-142.

Lewis, H. R. & Streitfeld, H. S. Growth games. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

Lieberman, M. A., Yalom, I. D., & Miles, M. B. Encounter groups: first facts. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

Lieberman, M. A., Yalom, I. D. & Miles, M. B. Impact on participants. In L. N. Solomon and B. Berzow (Eds.) New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972, 119-134.

Lowen, A. The betrayal of the body, New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Lowen, A. Bio-energetic group therapy. In M. M. Ruitenbeek (Ed.) Group therapy today: styles, methods and techniques. New York: Atherton Press, 1969.

Luke, B., & Seashore, C. Generalizations on research and speculations from experience related to laboratory training design. In R. T. Golembiewski and A. Blumberg (Eds.) Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers Inc., 1970, 430-435.

Mann, L. The effects of emotional role playing on desire to modify smoking habits. Journal of Experimental and Psychology, 1967, 3, 334-348.

Mann, L. & Janis, I. L. A follow-up study on the long termeffects of emotional role-playing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 339-342.

Maslow, A. The psychology of science: a reconnaissance. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1969.

Maslow, A. Some basic propositions of a growth and self-actualization psychology. IN E. A. Southwell & M. Merbaum (Eds.) Personality: readings in theory and research. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1971.

Mason, W. A. Early deprivation in the nonhuman primates: implications for human behavior. In D. C. Glass (Ed.) Environmental influences. New York: The Rockefeller University Press, 1968, 70-101.

Masters, R., & Houston, J. Mind games, the guide to inner space. New York: The Viking Press, 1972.

Matson, F. W. Humanistic theory: the third revolution in psychology. The Humanist, 1971, XXXI (2).

May, R. Love and will. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1969.

McGrath, J. E., & Altman, I. Small group research: a synthesis and critique of the field. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Miles, M. Changes during and following laboratory training: a clinical experimental study. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1965, 1.

Miller, N. Learning of visceral and glandular responses. Science, 1969, 163, 434-445.

Montagu, A. Touching: the human significance of the skin. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1971.

Moreno, J. L. The psychodrama. In J. E. Fairchild (Ed.) Personal problems and psychological frontiers. New York: Sheridan House, 1957, 276-285.

Moreno, J. L. The Viennese origins of the encounter movement, paving the way for existentialism, group psychotherapy and psychodrama. Group Psychotherapy, 1969, XXII (1, 2).

Moscovici, F. Sensitivity training: a study of perceptions. (Port) Argquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia Aplicada, 1972, 24 (1), 63-72.

Mouton, J. S., Blake, R., & Olmstead, J. A. The relationship between frequency of yielding and the disclosure of personal identity. Journal of Personality, 1955-56. 24. 339-247.

Ornstein, R. E. The psychology of consciousness. New York: The Viking Press, 1972.

Pervin, L. A. Personality: theory, assessment and research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.

Ruitenbeek, H. M. The new group therapies. New York: Avon Books, 1970.

Serizawa, K. Massage, the oriental method. San Francisco: Japan Publications, Inc. 1972

Schutz, W. C. Joy, expanding human awareness. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1969.

Shapiro, D., Tursky, B., & Schwartz, G. E. Control of blood pressure in man by operant condition. Circulation Research, 1970, suppl. 1, 26, 27, 1-27, 1-32.

Shapiro, D., Tursky, B., & Schwartz, G. E. Differnetiation of heart rate and systolic blood pressure in many by operant conditioning. Psychosomatic Medicine, 1970, 32, 417-423.

Siroka, R. W., Siroka, E. K., & Schloss, G. A. Sensitivity training and group encounter. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1971.

Sokoloff, N., Yaffe, S., Weintraub, D., & Blase, B. Effects of handling on the subsequent development of premature infants. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 765-768.

Swami Kriyananda. Eastern thoughts, Western thoughts. California: Ananda Publications, 1973.

Reddy, W. B. Screening and selection of participants. In L. N. Solomon and B. Berzow (Eds.) New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972, 53-67.

Reich, W. Character analysis. New York: Noonday Press, 1967.

Rosenfeld, L. B. Human interaction in the small group setting. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973.

Talbut, F. Discussion. Transactions of the American Pediatric Society, 1941, 62.

Tart, C. T. (Ed.) Altered states of consciousness, a book of readings. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.

Tepas, D. T. The electrophsyiological correlates of vision in a uniform field. M. A. Whitcom (Ed.) Visual problems of the armed forces. Washington: The National Academy of Science, National Research Council, 1962, 21-25.

Wallace, R. K., & Benson, H. The physiology of meditation. Scientific American, February 1972, 84-90.

Wiseman, G., & Baker, L. Speech-interpersonal communication. (2nd ed.) New York: Chandler Publishing Company, 1974.

THE PRESENT STATE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS OF GROWTH PROMOTIVE COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR: A RESPONSE

Carl E. Larson

University of Denver

Barker and Malandro's review of research on personal growth is a reasonably careful and comprehensive one. And lest we confuse the bearer of the news with the news itself, we should add that if the results of research on personal growth are equivocal and inconclusive, if the concepts associated with the research are ill-defined, if it is occasionally difficult to figure out what the results have to do with "growth promoting communication behavior", Barker and Malandro need not be faulted. They are simply reporting the state of the art. And if there is a weakness in the review, it is, perhaps, the attempt to cover too much material, of too diverse a nature, too quickly. But again, the fact that the review reflects conceptual unclarity, diversity of focus, and somewhat superficial research questions is fairly accurate portrayal of the current state of affairs in the continuing attempts to understand the relationship between human communication and personal growth.

Perhaps at this point, toward the end of these conference proceedings, you are wondering what difference it makes whether the research on growth promoting behavior has produced equivocal findings. With respect to the broader cultural phenomenon of people turning inward, searching for self-fulfillment, exploring new life styles and new ways of relating to others, the research findings probably don't matter a whole lot. The more or less structured growth-promoting activities referred to in this volume are things that individuals have done and will continue to do in respone to personal, organizational, and societal conditions. It is circumstance which generates the activity, and it is involvement in the activity which apparently matters to the participants.

For us, the research matters in a specific and quite different sense than it does for all the many prople involved as participants in structured growth-promoting activities. All of the contributors to this volume are based in academic institutions. Many of the readers, we suspect, are involved in other institutional settings and are either directly or indirectly connected with formal training programs in these institutions. For us, then, the research findings have implications for specific questions: (1) Should we promote the further institutionalization of personal growth and direct our institutinal resources toward those ends? (2) If yes,

are we obliged to help people make more enlightened decisions about the consequences of involvement in such structured activities? If those of us who are involved in the planning and execution of such activities feel at least partially responsible for their consequences then we probably ought to promote better research and attend more carefully to its results.

A Different War

The war that Barker and Malandro referred to at the beginning of their paper has, if not ended, at least subsided, although the reader may have found reasons in this volume for questioning either the fact or the legitimacy of the "truce." Nevertheless, it is important to point out that Barker and Malandro have described only one arena in which the war subsided. There are other arenas in which the war continues to rage. In other institutional settings, particularly industrial and governmental ones, the conceptual and methodological issues are still being contested. This other arena might broadly be labeled "evaluation research," and more specifically "program evaluation." For the last five years a significant portion of my time has been spent in doing evaluation research, and I continue to encounter vigorous skirmishes between humanistically-oriented trainers and empirically-oriented researchers. Much of the research that Barker and Malandro review would probably have very little merit when considered from the point of view of evaluation research. Evaluation researchers might remind us of some old and worn issues which nevertheless deserve continued and repeated attention.

First, much of the research reviewed, especially in the nonverbal section, reports little that one ought to have much confidence in. That is, the fact that program conductors describe their programs as "successful" has relatively little informational value. Unless, of course, we really expected program conductors, or a substantial number of them, to describe their programs as "unsuccessful." Do we expect trainers to admit failure as readily as they admit success? My own experiences as a trainer occurred mostly in the sixties when laboratory training was undergoing the transition from competence-oriented T-group training to personal growth-oriented encounter group training. But it seems to me both types of trainers exhibited remarkable ability to interpret a wide range of group events and personal developments as indicative of positive outcomes. Perhaps it would be naive to expect trainers to do otherwise. Especially if a large part of their personal identity, and the major portion of their professional identity, are connected with their involvement in what may be perceived as a "helping relationship."

Secondly, in much of the research Barker and Malandro review the "growth" is indicated by self-reported sentiments of participants. It is not so much the accuracy of self-reported sentiments that I would question. Indeed, many, if not most participants in laboratory experiences seem genuinely pleased with the experiences and their involvement in them. But self-reported sentiments suffer from a generally recognized "halo" effect. If evaluation procedures are administered close to or at the end

of a laboratory experience, when the sweetness and harmony in group development is likely to occur, and if the participants have voluntarily exposed themselves to such experiences with personal expenditures of time and/or money, then it is probably easier to admit to oneself that the decision to participate was a good one than it is to admit to oneself that the decision to participate was a bad one.

Incidentally, in the earlier and mid sixties I can recall a number of training staff meetings in which we discussed research findings which were emerging from field settings. These findings suggested that individuals who had experienced laboratory training and had left the training context to return to their everyday contexts were rated by their associates and co-workers in ways inconsistent with the purposes of the training they had experienced. My own interpretation of the shift from that training which emphasized interpersonal competence to that training which emphasized personal/inner growth is that the shift occurred at least partially because the interpersonal competence approach just wasn't working. And it seems to me that it was at about this same time that our training staff and the training literature began to consider more seriously the question of whether certain aspects of laboratory training might not be investing individuals with values and behaviors which might prove inappropriate in most social contexts outside the training laboratory itself. If this argument has any merit at all then the wisdom of assessing personal growth in terms of self-reported sentiments about the training experience itself seems questionable.

Third, there seems to be great disparity in the kinds of indicators used to assess training consequences or outcomes. When confronted with such a diverse array of indicators for what is supposed to be, at least ostensibly, a single general concept, we should probably ask whether we are interpreting the research correctly. It is quite possible that much of the research reviewed by Barker and Malandro was not intended to reflect, and should not be taken as reflecting anything about human or personal growth. With a few major exceptions, which I will refer to later, I found myself reading the preceding review and frequently wondering what, if anything, the research findings had to do with growth-promoting communication behavior.

Barker and Malandro have alluded to all these conceptual and methodological problems, and more. And I am not optimistic about their resolution. The various areas of research reviewed seem quite unrelated. And the ways in which growth is conceptualized and assessed seem quite diverse. It is odd that in such a comprehensive review of research on "growth promoting communication behavior" there is so little that is instructive with respect to how communication behavior or growth should be characterized. Perhaps we are taking to eclectic view of the phenomenon. Perhaps we should take even more fundamental steps, such as deciding in what terms we wish to characterize human growth, and how communication might conceivably relate to such a phenomenon.

A Simplified Conceptual Scheme

How can we get a conceptual handle on growth promoting communication behavior? Since the conference participants are all communication specialists, let us take for our point of departure human communication. Immediately we are confronted by a potentially immobilizing problem. There are so many different types of human communication that it is difficult to know where to begin. This is not to say that theoretical units for describing the nature of human communication are non-existent. Indeed, they are plentiful. Nor is it to say that human communication has been infrequently characterized or described by researcher and theorists. Indeed, human communication has been described from so many points of view that it is difficult to decide which points of view to attend to and which to dismiss. What are the important dimensions in terms of which human communication should be characterized? Status? Trust? Attraction? Roles? Motives? Strategies? There is no poverty of theoretical constructs in terms of which human communication might be described. What we need is a way of determining which theoretical units should be employed. That is, which theoretical units will most accurately and adequately describe the nature of human communication and which concepts will be potentially profitable in terms of relating human communication to personal growth.

If we wish to know which basic dimensions or factors characterize the interpersonal communication behavior of individuals, a reasonably sound approach would involve the following: (1) We would ask individuals to describe ways in which they communicate with specific others. (2) We would ask individuals to describe ways in which particular others communicate with them. (3) We would gather such descriptions from a variety of social contexts, i.e. marriage, work, etc. (4) We would identify the dimensions or factors in terms of which individuals perceive their own communication with others and the communication of others with them (5) We would compare these dimensions or factors, across the social contexts, in an attempt to discover those dimensions or factors which are basic to interpersonal communication, that is, those dimensions or factors which characterize interpersonal communication regardless of the social context in which the communication occurs. The advantage of such an approach should be obvious. It requires no a priori assumptions about which particular dimension or factors are important in describing interpersonal communication. Those factors or dimensions which are important in describing interpersonal communication, it is assumed, are those which emerge from the description of the participants themsleves. Such an approach begins with what seems to be a logical first step. In terms of which basic dimensions or characteristics do individuals perceive their communicative relationships with others?

We have employed this basic approach since 1965. The first investigation was an exploration of interpersonal communication patterns as perceived by husbands and wives (Larson, 1965). The second investigation, which was a substantial replication of the marital communication study, explored the ways in which institutionalized youths, "juvenile delinquents," perceive their interpersonal communication with counselors (Dodge, 1971). The third

investigation explored the ways in which interpersonal communication was perceived by fathers and sons (Mix, 1972). The fourth investigation explored the ways in which interpersonal communication was perceived by supervisors and subordinates in an organizaitonal setting (Ross, 1973). All four of these investigations were doctoral dissertations. Each of the investigations asked the participants, in the four respective interpersonal communication contexts, to describe either their communication with the other or the other's communication with them, or both. The participant descriptions of their interpersonal communication were in terms of fifty characteristics of interaction (Ruesch, Block, and Bennett, 1953). These fifty characteristics included such things as the extent to which one person was critical of another, liked being with the other, agreed with the other, trusted the other, felt comfortable with the other, and so on. Through factor analysis, the researchers attempted to identify ways in which these fifty variables combined, within a particular social context, to produce basic or underlying dimensions of communication. These basic or underlying dimensions were called "communication patterns."

As might be expected, there were a number of different communication patterns which seemed to be operating in the four different social contexts. For example, a pattern of reluctant submission was discovered in the marriage context. This pattern was characterized by one person reluctantly giving into another, apparently to avoid prolonged conflict. In the youth-counselor context, a pattern was discovered which involved competitive interaction, in which one person attempted to outdo or to establish a strategically superior position with respect to the other. There were many such patterns discovered in the four different social contexts.

It would have been possible, of course, for us to have discovered that the ways in which individuals communicated with each other were totally different for the four social contexts. However, when we compared the patterns which were discovered in the different social contexts through another statistical operation which yields "coefficients of congruence" (Harman, 1967), one basic communication pattern was found to recur in all of the social contexts. This pattern was labeled "acceptance-rejection" (Ross, 1973). The participants tended to see their communication with others, and the other's communication with them, in terms of the extent to which interpersonal communication behavior exhibited an acceptance or rejection of the person as a person. Central to this basic pattern were two related interaction characteristics, the extent to which one person was critical of another and the extent to which one person belittled another. Participants tended to perceive their own interpesonal communication with others, and the other's communication with them, in terms of whether the communicative behavior exhibited or implied a basic acceptance or rejection of the person as a person. That such a dimension is central to the perception of communication by participants may not be surprising. What is surprising is that this dimension should be the only one which was basic to the four social contexts we have enumerated. The acceptance-rejection dimension of communication has been recognized by others as central to an understanding of

interpersonal communication. Sieburg (1971) focuses her attention on confirmation and disconfirmation in communication, and Giffin (1970) focuses his attention on communication denial. Both of these theoretical points of view are consistent with our discovery that the basic dimension which seems to characterize the perception of communication, at least in the contexts we have explored, is one which involves personal acceptance or rejection.

Why should individuals perceive communication in terms of a basic dimension of acceptance or rejection? Our answer to this question begins with the statement of two premises: (1) Most communicative acts involve some degree of disclosure. (2) Acts of disclosure involve risk.

When an individual communicates with another, he discloses something about himself to the other. The degree of disclosure involved in communicative acts varies considerably, but some degree of self-disclosure is almost always present. Your communicative acts disclose what you believe, how you feel, your attitudes, those things which you consider important, what you know or think you know, etc. Even relatively impersonal communicative acts may carry with them some degree of disclosure, and the risks associated with such disclosures. When you interact with others you exhibit and disclose information about your beliefs, your knowledge, or your attitudes with respect to the topic of discussion. You risk being ignored, being disagreed with, being ridiculed, or any of many other potentially "good" or "bad" consequences of your communicative behavior. So long as the consequences are undefined, or less than totally predictable, then some degree of risk, though perhaps minimal, is involved. If you and your friends are sitting around trying to decide what to do this evening, and you make a suggestion, then you have disclosed something about your wishes or interests and you run the risk of finding that your wishes and interests will not be supported by your friends. If you strike up a conversation with a stranger you run the risk of being told to "bug off". If you find one of your friends sitting alone and on the verge of tears, your subsequent communicative behavior may disclose concern, but you also risk being told, either directly or indirectly, to mind your own business. Even such a relatively impersonal act as the one in which I am currently engaged discloses some of my thinking about human communication. The inevitable feedback from colleagues is the risk which I am taking. Most communicative acts involve some degree of self disclosure and most acts of disclosure involve risk.

People who display apprehension, anxiety, or fear about engaging in communication are called "reticent." It is interesting to note that in interviews with reticent students, fear of grades, anxiety about derision of classmates, and fear of teacher's evaluations are recurring themes (Wilson, 1969). One researcher has explored in considerable detail the personality characteristics of reticent and non-reticent students (Johnson, 1970). This researcher concluded that reticent individuals have just as much need for understanding and encouragement and need to be admired and receive recognition as do non-reticent students. But reticent students were

characterized by insufficient "aggressiveness" to pursue these means and goals. Reticents were characterized by not "willing to risk demand-exposures (Johnson, 1970, p. 141)." Thus, the attention and concern of reticents seem focused primarily on the unpleasant consequences of communicative acts, rather than the potentially pleasant consequences. We suspect, however, that everyone, including the reader, has experienced enough of the unpleasant consequences of some communicative acts that there should be little difficulty in intuitively appreciating the thrust of our first two premises. Most communicative acts involve some degree of disclosure. And most acts of disclosure are associated with risk. Our conclusion, therefore, is that human communication involves risk.

How then does human communication relate to personal growth? Let me suggest two very basic answers.

First, it seems to me that personal growth is a function of our willingness to risk interaction with others, our willingness to enter social context other than the ones we are accusteomed to, our willingness to encounter new people under new circumstances. Structured growth-promoting activities might be considered successful if they subsequently broaden our range of experiences with others, if they invest us with a sense of adventure and quiet our apprehensions about involving ourselves communicatively with others. This point of view is not inconsistent with a perspective on communication which has been around for a long time, a perspective which asserts that healthy, well-adjusted individuals are those whose behavioral repertoires are broad, who can adjust their communicative behaviors readily depending upon the interpersonal situation, who are not bound by narrow and inflexible communication patterns.

Second, it seems to me that what is risked in human communication are definition, concepts, and images of self. That human communication is inseparably tied to the formation and maintenance of "self" has been argued by social scientists for many years. If human communication inevitably involves the risking of self, then a reasonable definition of growth-promoting communication behavior should take into account one's view of self. In the research reviewed by Barker and Malandro, there were several investigations which assessed training outcomes primarily in terms of the impact of training on self. The investigation by Burke and Bennis moves in the direction that I would like to see "growth" defined conceptually and operationally: self-perception moving toward ideal self. If structured growth-promoting activities can result in the individual's perceiving that he is becoming the kind of person he eventually wants to be, then the activity might be considered successful.

These are simplistic notions about growth-promoting communication behavior. The simplification is deliberate. Sometimes we are over-powered by our methodologies. Frequently we are only confused by our

research findings. As is true in so many other cases in the social sciences, the research reviewed in this volume is drawn from so many diverse areas and orientations, from psychosynthesis to laboratory studies of unobtrusive persuasive techniques, that our biggest problem is resolving the disjunctions. Let's ease up a bit, and spend some time trying to figure out what the phenomenon is that we are talking about, and in what terms we wish to talk about it. There is no need to make reckless haste. The search for personal growth, and ways to attain it, will probably be with us for awhile.

References

Dodge, C. Communication factors associated with reduced recidivism of paroled youths in Colorado. Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1971.

Giffin, K. Social alienation by communication denial. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56, 347-357, 1970.

Harman, H. Modern factor analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Johnson, C. I. A descriptive study of the relationship of certain critical values and motivational achievement to self-concept in reticent and non-reticent speakers. Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1970.

Larson, C. E. Interaction, dogmatism, and communication effectiveness: An exploratory study. Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1965.

Mix, C. R. Interpersonal communication patterns, personal values and predictive accuracies: An exploratory study. Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1972.

Ross, R. E. Perceived communication patterns and predictive accuracy of supervisor-subordinate dyads. Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1973.

Ruesch, J., Block, J. and Bennett, L. The assessment of communication: A method for the analysis of social interaction. Journal of Psychology, 40, 59-89, 1953.

Sieburg, E. and Larson, C.E. Dimensions of interpersonal response. Paper presented to the International Communication Association Annual Conference, Phoenix, Arizona, 1971.

PRESENT STATE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS OF GROWTH-PROMOTING COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR

by

Patrick J. McDermott
University of Wyoming

It was extremely difficult for me to deal with much of the content that Barker and Malandro dealt with. One's biases always seem to get in the way of any critical analysis of another's work. I'm sure that it will be quite apparent to anyone who takes the time to read this manuscript where my biases lay, and how these biases have influenced my response.

Barker and Malandro begin their paper with a discussion of a covert (and sometimes overt) war that has been fought during the past three or four decades between the "behavioral scientist" and the "humanist." The description of the events and discussions leading up to the war was excellent and indicated the whys and wherefors of the major split in our army. My major response to this section of their paper concerns the truce they allude to. There may be a truce in the field of psychology brought about by the formulation of the Association for Humanistic Psychology, but the truce doesn't appear to have been signed as of yet by communication scholars. This fact becomes readily evident when one takes even a cursory glance through the major journals in our discipline. How many articles do we find dealing with the material discussed in this paper? Few indeed, if any.

Let us next consider Barker and Malandro's statement alluding to the fact that the aftermath of the struggle has brought with it a need to redefine research. He goes on to say that it is necessary to become concerned with the "product" as opposed to only the "means". Now I don't know about the authors' individual research practices, but I was always under the impression that the primary concern for any researcher must be on the "product," or the research question, with the tools used to get to the answers as a secondary concern. Kaplan best stated this in his text when he said:

> "...What is distinctive of behavioral science, therefore, is basically its subject matter; the techniques that the subject matter permits or demands are only derivative." (Kaplan, 1964; p. 32)

I'm sure neither Barker nor Malandro would disagree with this statement as they later state that a research mode is considered appropriate when it is appropriate to the subject or area which is being investigated.

My last response to the introductory phase of the Barker and Malandro paper concerns the four categories in which research in the area of personal

growth naturally fail. On page seven they list the categories as: (1) empirical, (2) case studies, (3) exploratory, and (4) descriptive. I don't see these categories as being mutually exclusive. They can all fall under the "empirical" category. Perhaps Professor Barker and Ms. Malandro meant to call category one as experimental instead of empirical. In this manner we can then talk about four methods under one methodology, empricism.

INTRAPERSONAL AWARENESS

Barker and Malandro begin this section of their paper with a statement dealing with the inherent need of an individual to understand himself so that he can better understand others. They go on to state that it is with this self-introspection that the feelings of other are more easily understood, thus, allowing the person to be better able to complete the communication cycle. Who could disagree with this statement? I would venture to say not many at this conference would. The problem is that after the initial statement Barker and Malandro appear to have completely forgotten the focus of the statement, knowing self and the development of self concept, and the focus of the conference, communication and growth.

For example, the two research areas they discuss were psychosynthesis and biofeedback. Under psychosynthesis there is a short discussion dealing with the basic components usually considered. Nowhere in this discussion do we find any attempt to tie these concepts to communication and individual growth. In defense of the authors I should admit that the research in this area is in the exploratory stage and almost completely ignored by communication researchers.

The second area, biofeedback, completely lost me. Maybe because of my own ignorance, but I failed to see the connection between the "steady-gaze" research and communication. Also, what is the connection between a persistent alpha activity with increase amplitude modulation during samadhi and communication? Expecially after putting hands in ice cold water for a 45-55 minute time period. I guess what I am trying to say here is that Barker and Malandro owe us some explanation on how this type of research can be tied to research on interpersonal growth.

The major disappointment in this section of their paper is the failure to mention any of the research dealing with the concepts of self, self concept, or self esteem. Their opening statement mentioned these concepts ...and then, nothing. There has been considerable research (see Guthrie, 1938; Erikson, 1956; Garfinkel, 1963; Gross, 1964; Bennis, 1964; and Keutsch and Brown, 1964) dealing with these concepts, much of it dealing with the inner-action of self-esteem and the willingness to communicate.

One last response to this section of the paper deals with the topic area itself. One of the biases I alluded to earlier in my response is that

I do not consider that which goes on in one's head communication. That is thinking. The term communication implies some type of social interaction. I am aware that some of you might accuse me of narrowing the field somewhat, and I guess that is what I am trying to do. But if we are to continue to exist as an academic discipline we are going to have to be willing to admit that all human behavior, internal or external, is not communication. Hence, if we are to be called communication scientists, we are going to have to study communication itself. This implies a definition of communication that includes the term interaction.

The study of social interaction does not preclude the possibility of research on an individual's personal growth via communication. For instance, there are some who feel that the whole idea of self-concept and self-esteem comes form social interaction, i.e., communication. Kinch (1963) goes so far as to give us a general theoretical statement that summarizes the writings of G. Mead, Cooley and several others when he states that ". . . The individual's conception of himself emerges from social interaction and, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual." Two basic postulates are implicit in the Kinch statement: (1) the individuals self-concept is based on his perception of the way others are responding to him; and (2) the individual's self-concept functions to direct his behavior to others. With this general theory in mind it should be easy for communication researchers to begin to formulate testable hypotheses dealing with a person's growth via communication.

INTERPERSONAL, NONVERBAL AND SMALL GROUP AWARENESS

I have combined the three areas, interpersonal, nonverbal, and small group awareness under one heading for obvious reasons. The research reported by Barker and Malandro all come out of some type of encounter groups.

Basic Encounter Groups

As Barker and Maladro suggest, the evidence is confusing at best as to the value of the basic encounter groups on individual growth.

The supporters of encounter group training call it a new frontier in social psychology, a means of making people more innovative, honest, trusting, and free. It is not a form of psychoanalysis, they say, but a significant outgrowth of adult education rooted in the emotions rather than the intellect. Many organizations view it as a method of helping people break down communication barriers.

The skeptics term encounter groups as "the acidless trip". Some even go so far as to link sensitivity training with communism, brainwashing, and sexual promiscuity. The more responsible skeptic, including many in the American Medical Association, question the wisdom of stripping a person's

emotions to the core in a group setting. They challenge, and rightly so, the use of unskilled trainers and the frequent absence of prescreening to keep psychotics out of the programs.

The growth of encounter groups has been so quick that most "experts" have been caught with their pants down. Neither the American Psychiatric Association nor the American Psychological Association has taken an official position as to the value of the many forms of encounter groups. As Barker and Malandro suggest, the evidence is so contradictory that it would be impossible to take an educated position on its value.

Some words of warning seem necessary for those who attempt some form of encounter group or sensitivity training. Because of the inherent initial conflict in most encounter groups, I feel that a skilled trainer is a requisite. As Jerry Spiegel, an active NTL trainer in Chicago observes: "In most cases, a poor or untrained trainer will simply create a dull group. But there's always the chance that two people will really get into a major conflict, or that a participant may be on the verge of real emotional difficulty, so the trainer must be ready to intervene. T-group training is like fire. It can warm the house and make it comfortable, or it can burn the damn thing down."

Benjamin Jeffries, M.D., a Detroit psychiatrist and chairman of the Michigan State Medical Society's Committee on Mental Health goes one step further in his observations about the use of skilled trainers. He states: "...I personally feel that the only people who should be doing this type of training are psychiatrist, psychologist, and psychiatric social workers." Dana L. Farnsworth, M.D., and director of health services for Harvard University and chairman of the AMA Council on Mental Health also discusses the widespread use of untrained or unskilled trainers. He claims: "...Their intentions may have been honest, but the results are sometimes disastrous." As Dr. Farnsworth puts it: "...Compassion without competence soon becomes quackery."

Interpretation of Results

We must also be careful in our interpretation of the results reported in the Barker and Malandro paper. Even though the results are somewhat inconsistent, there appears to be a trend which supports the idea that there is value to be derived in T-groups--sensitivity--encounter-group training. For instance, Clark, Harrison and Oshry, Burke and Bennis, Moscovic, and others all found significant results which support the concept that T-groups aid in such things as self-awareness, self-satisfaction, self esteem, awareness of others self, personal growth, and a change in behavior. The major problem in interpreting these results lies in the fact that most of the tests were administered immediately after a T-group session, or within a 2-6 week time period after attending a session. I would suggest that a long-range research plan be instituted where the person is observed 3--6--9

--12 months after participating in an encounter--T-group--sensitivity session. This research should satisfy the skeptics who wonder about the long-term benefits from laboratory training, along with giving general stability to the results. It would also confirm or disconfirm the NTL claim that two-thirds of the persons who have taken T-group training have improved communication skills.

Psychodrama

Psychodrama, as a method of therapeutic or growth promoting communication appears to hold a lot of promise. The results of laboratory experimentation are somewhat inconsistent, but the reports on case studies are overwhelmingly in favor of this method as a method of solving personal problems such as drug addiction, alchoholism, and others.

Even though the results do indicate successes with the used of psychodrama, we should be careful how it is used. The same suggestion given in the T-group section seem applicable here.

First of all, only a trained person should attempt to administer psychodrama.

Secondly, we should look at the results which indicate successes with a very careful eye as to their generalizability. One question I would ask is if the positive effect of psychodrama hold over time. Again, I would suggest a time design where the subject is observed periodically over a minimum time of one year.

My last suggestion on this area deals with the type of research. I aggree with Barker and Malandro when they claim that the most convincing research is found in case studies. We should report more of these. I would cast a very jaundiced eye on the generalizability of research done in the laboratory situation where random subjects were used.

Nonverbal

Barker and Malandro deal with only one area of nonverbal behavior. They refer to this area as touching behavior or sensory awareness. The review of the research in this area was excellent and laid the groundwork as to the importance of touch behavior to personal growth. Then, once again, we take a "trip" down the encounter group trail.

First, they deal with nudity groups by giving us the positive results of several studies which indicate successes in the amount of "openness" experienced by participants. I would like to know two things about these results: (1) how was openness measured, i.e., was it the amount or quality of communication behavior (etc.); and (2) what were the long term effects of the treatment? Before we can place any importance on these results we need to know the answers to the above questions.

The second area dealt with by Barker and Malandro was sensory awakening developed by Gunther (1968). Here the discussion of the research leaves a lot to be desired. This is not the fault of the authors, lets face it, little, if any "good" research has been reported on the value of sensory awareness. I do question whether this type of behavior is communicative in nature. For example, one of the new programs or "games" being practiced by some sensory awareness groups is called the "crotch feel." This is a special technique used in nude marathons. The entire group surrounds each person in turn and closely examines his or her genitals. Now I agree that this may be growth promoting, but I would venture to say that the growth would be physiological in nature rather than psychological. I don't think I need say more.

Another game, "the group grope," is used to get people acquainted by feeling each other. In many instances this turns into an attach on genital privacy, and as suggested by Bach (1972), can cause great emotional harm to the participants of such a "game."

Again, I would like to have seen Barker and Malandro justify these types of behavior as being communicative in nature. My own ignorance in this area may be keeping me from seeing it.

Research Problems and Directions

Interest in communication behavior and personal growth has grown during the past six to eight year. Communication texts in the areas of small group behavior interpersonal communication, organizational communication, and cross-cultural communication are spending an increasingly amount of space in the areas we have heard discussed at this conference. And yet, what is it we can really tell anyone about the area that is based on any hard evidence? Very little, if anything.

The conflicting evidence, or lack of evidence, as suggested by Barker and Malandro, can probably be attributed to the lack of an "acceptable" criterion measures which are verifiable. I would suggest that the lack of acceptable measures is attributable to our preoccupation with experimentation. That is, we are so occupied with manipulating and controlling the environment that we fail to look for things as they exist in a natural setting. If we are to obtain any useful insights into the material we have been discussing today, we are going to have to look for the positive and negative affects of growth training within the operating environment of the participants of such training.

Secondly, I completely agree with Barker and Malandro when they state the need for the development of valid criterion measures for establishing baseline data for subjects involved in growth training programs. But let's

not lose sight of those tools we already have. For instance, communication researchers could look directly at communication as a dependent variable both during a growth-promoting session and at predetermined time periods afterward. With the use of some type of "content analysis" we can be looking for changes in the communication habits of subjects. Comparisons can then be made of data gathered at the differing time periods in order to determine any lasting effects of the training in question.

My next suggestion deals with the type of data that has been gathered in the past. Most of it has been in the form of direct testimony from participants directly after the sessions. This testimony is important, but not enough. Because of the "initiation rites" of most of these sessions, I find it hard to believe much of the data gathered from subjects immediately afterward. Much of it appears to be self-justification, that is, one could easily say that becuase of the cost in time and money, and the frustration of becoming "open" with others, that I had better have gotten something out of it. Hence, we probably find subjects who stretch the truth somewhat when asked about the value of their session. I would suggest that the self-report questionnaires be compared with questionnaires from others in the subject's interacting groups. In other words, if the subject claims he now finds it easier to relate to others, I would be interested in finding out how others perceive the subjects behavior. Admittedly, this data would be hard to come by, but I feel it is necessary in order to validate the subject's responses. This data can be drawn from the persons organizational ties, his family, and his social group.

Finally, as we have noted often in this paper, none of the research on outcomes of the differing group experiences is a masterpieces of precision. I, like many others jump on this research and generally call it "bad." Perhaps we should be a little more considerate when evaluating research in its exploratory stages. Who knows, when proper measures are developed, we may have the "new frontier" Barker and Malandro alluded to in the final line of their paper.

SUMMARY

I have been critical of the Barker and Malandro paper in generally one area. My basic concern has been whether the areas discussed fall under the purview of communication. I do not imply that they don't, I just ask the authors to show us where. They fail to do this.

My second concern has direct relationship with the first. That is, I am extremely concerned with the irresponsibility or lack of ethics portrayed by many who call themselves "professional" in the group encounter, group awareness area. For instance, Odiorne (1972) has stated that there is likely to be one person with a serious problem in practically every encounter group. The problem may be even greater. Lieberman et al,

(1972) claim the casualty rate is as high as 9.6 percent in many groups. Yet, because of the lack of professional ethics, very little fore-warning is given to subjects who participate in the groups,along with little attempt to screen the participants. Hence, the group experience can hinder growth instead of promoting growth for some.

As grave as the problem mentioned above is, this finding is less important than Lieberman's finding that the persons least able to identify casualties were the group leaders. This worries me.

REFERENCES

Bennis, W. G., et. al., Interpersonal Dynamics, Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1964.

Deutsch, M., and Brown, B., "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," Journal of Social Issues, 1964, 20, 24-35.

Erikson, E. H., "The Problem of Ego Identity," American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1956, 4, 56-121.

Garfinkel, H., "Trust and Stable Actions," in O.J. Harvey, Motivation and Social Interaction, New York: Ronald, 1963.

Gross, E., and Stone, G. P., "Embarrassment and the Analysis of Role Requirements,: American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 70, 1-15.

Guthrie, E. R., The Psychology of Human Conflict, New York: Harper & Row 1938.

Kaplan, A., The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science. Scranton: Chandler, 1964.

Kinch, J. W., "A Formalized Theory of the Self Concept," American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 68, pp. 481-483.

Lieberman, M. A., Yalom, I. D., and Mileo, M. B., in Kurt Back's, "The Group Can Comfort But It Can't Cure," Psychology Today, December, 1972, pp 31.

Odiorne, G., in Kurt W., Back's, "The Group Can Comfort But It Can't Cure," Psychology Today, December, 1972, pp. 31.

COMMUNICATION AND GROWTH-PROMOTING BEHAVIOR: AN OVERVIEW AND SUGGESTIONS

by

Keith Miller
Philip Emmert
University of Wyoming

To summarize a set of papers as diverse and wide-ranging as those in this volume, is difficult at best and repetitive at worst, so we won't. The focus of this conference was on the following four questions:

(1) What are the crucial questions in the application of growth-promoting communication in the dyadic setting?

(2) What are the crucial questions in the application of growth-promoting communication in the group setting?

(3) What is the present state of research and research directions of growth-promoting communication behavior in personal crisis settings?

and (4) What is the present state of research and research directions of growth-promoting communication behavior?

With the benefit of hindsight, we would have changed those questions to the following:

(1) What is Growth?

(2) What is growth-promoting communication?

(3) Why is it growth-promoting?

and (4) How does it differ from "every-day" communication?

These three questions seem logically to precede the four used for the conference and we are not at all sure they were answered before anyone began answering the conference questions.

The past five to ten years have seen a great rise in concern in the field of communication about "growthful" relationships between persons. A good guess is that most of the concern has been "given" to us by others rather than having grown from within our own professional interests. That is, in the past decade much interest in the concerns of humanistic psychologists has arisen in the United States and has stimulated a plethora of interests

in sub-issues such as one's relationship with one's children, one's spouse, one's neighbors, colleagues, business associates, etc. The tangible forms of such interest have been in "growth-groups," "growth-games," "growth-books," "growth-courses," and "growth-conversations." Like most concerns which sweep the general and academic populations, this too will likely pass. in the meantime, we in communication have picked up the gauntlet and are running with it. But we probably do not know where to run so we just run and shout to all who will listen: "Become a more effective, fully-functioning human being--enroll in my communication course." But what is it we are teaching? Where are we going with this emphasis on "growth?" What does it mean "to grow?" What are our assumptions? Where is the evidence that what we teach/practice actually leads to "growth" or healthier relationships? Do we have a basis,a foundation on which to build or have we simply picked up a popular battle cry and adapted our own personal intrests to our professional lives?

Some years ago, it was fashionable to say the field of communication had no theories of its own, that we were barren in our conceptualizations. Naturally, many of our most notable scholars and prolific writers jumped to the fore and denied such heretical accusations and did so with such gusto that it has now become unfashionable to assert that we have few theoretical foundations. We do not wish to rekindle that fire. We would suggest, however, that at least where "growth-promoting communication" is concerned, we have precious few answers to the questions posed above.

Before the reader stalks off in a rage muttering to himself, "Maybe they don't, but I do!" think for a moment and try to answer this: Why is what we call "growth-promoting communication behavior" growth-promoting? What are the essential qualities about whatever it is which make it inherently different from any other type of communication behavior? What, if anything, unites all the varying focuses and insights represented by the papers of this volume? Do we have any guiding focus?

The purpose of this conference was to stimulate thinking about an area in interpersonal communication which is steadily and increasingly receiving more attention and commands more of our teaching time. To stimulate thinking usually results in raising many more questions than are answered. This conference was no exception. For the rest of this essay, we would like to consider three questions which seem to have arisen as a result of the paper and to make a suggestion based on those questions. Actually, two of the questions are subordinate to the more basic questions, "What is 'growth'?"

WHAT IS GROWTH?

It is interesting to note that in only one paper presented at this conference did a definition of "growth" occur. Larson indicated in his paper that he would like to see 'growth' defined conceptually and operationally as self-perception moving toward ideal self. (p.159) Do the rest of the authors feel that "growth" is too obvious a term to waste time in

trying to define? Probably not. The lack of definitions, rather, seems symptomatic of the confusion in our field about what we mean by "growth" and how to measure it. This state of affairs is suggested in the papers of McDermott and Barker and Malandro, who wonder aloud and ask just what behaviors we are talking about when referring to "growth." Such confusion and wonderment is fully justified, all too often we tend to talk either in theoretically esoteric or poetically mystic terms.

We are lacking an operational definition of "growth" If someone "feels good" is that "growth"? If a person says they have grown, is that "growth"? It is imperative for us to agree upon an operational definition of growth before we can generate theory which links communication behavior and growth. If we cannot operationalize this concept and, further, reliably measure it, we will be unable to develop empirically based theory. If this is not possible, then we might as well call what we have "a system of beliefs" rather than a behavioral science.

It should be obvious that in order to study the two issures we are about to discuss, the construct of "growth" must be operationalized. Further, methods of measuring it must be developed before controlled studies can be conducted which are addressed to the following two issues.

The other two major issues which appear to spring from the papers in this volume are: (1) Is "growth" an intrapersonal phenomenon or an interpersonal phenomenon; (2) What communication behaviors allow (or cause?) "growth"? Oviously, the territory covered by these issues is so vast, that their treatment here can only be of the most general nature and is intended only to stimulate some thought about directions for our future efforts.

IS "GROWTH" AN INTERPERSONAL OR AN INTRAPERSONAL PHENOMENON?

To many this will seem an exceedingly strange question to ask for "growth" has nearly always been conceived of as "personal growth." The question here is whether that assumption and the subsequent research/teaching efforts have led us down, if not the wrong road, at least the short road. Possibly another assumption might be both more appropriate and more valuable to our research directions and outcomes. Briefly, we would like to suggest that "growth" may be a more manageable concept (and a more accurate one) if we conceive of growth as possible only in one's relationship with another, that is, in one's dyadic transactions. Growth may only take place and therefore can only be measured within the context of dyadic systems.

The assumptions historically leading us to believe growth is an intrapersonal phenomenon are so well-established in our thinking that even laying it out for inspection is difficult. There are implications, however, contained in several of the papers of this volume that invite this hypothesis. Running throughout the papers in this volume is the unstated assumption that

growth is something which occurs internally and is somehow transferable from one situation to another. It (growth) is something which has occured within an individual and which is "owned" only by two persons in concert, but not individually.

If we assume growth to be strictly an intrapersonal occurance, we are faced with all the difficulties enumerated in these papers. How can we measure it? What criteria should we choose to employ? Which ones are least capricious? We face all the problems recognized for so long by those dealing in any of the various group efforts in terms of assessing and validating carry-over value to the "back-home communication activities of the individual" mentioned by Tucker in his paper (pg.58) The concern over the training value of group experiences is common and led Tucker to say "...I also have the gnawing suspicion that there may be no relationship between the T-group experiences and anything else in life (p. 58)." If we assume growth to be an intrapersonal affair, we are also led to conceiving of communication as either the instrument of relating one's thoughts and feelings to another verbally and/or nonverbally in an attempt to find satisfactory ways of growing or as the mediating tool for ameliorating a crisis situation. This view carries the primary assumption that "communication is an essential precursor of growth-promoting behavior (Arnold, p. 77)" The problem here is in conceiving of communication as a "tool" rather than as a process. Perhaps some of these problems, problems which have been around so long they have become "traditional," can be answered or at least addressed if we choose to work from the other assumption--that growth is an interpersonal phenomenon. If we choose the interpersonal approach to growth, we switch our primary focus from individual criteria such as "self-perception moving toward ideal self (Larson, p.159)" or the subjective measures of satisfaction with which McDermott takes issue (p.169), and which Barker and Malandro lament as being too subjective (p.142) to a primary focus on the observable behaviors occuring between and directed toward the interactants of the dyadic system under scrutiny. (Self-reporting measures, of course will persist as supplemental measures.) One outcome of this focus switch is to give us an additional rationale for using communication behavior as a dependent variable in assessing growth as suggested by McDermott, (p.169). This particular measurement technique (using the message as a dependent variable) can, of course, happen under the auspices of either assumption. But if growth is seen as an intrapersonal growth only, we will be led time and time again to report little carry-over value from training to "real-life" or back-home experiences simply because we will have failed to account for the "new" dyadic systems in which the behavior is now being observed.

This is the second major problem area addressed by the switch of assumptions: the back-home problem discussed by Tucker and Donaghy in this volume, and by countless others elsewhere. One last major difference which might occur if we switch assumptions is that we might be led toward viewing communication not so much as an activity or "tool" as a statement or description of the relationship between the interactants of any given dyadic system.

What is the justification for switching our working assumption from viewing "growth" as a peculiarly interpersonal phenomenon? We might begin with an exhaustive treatment of theorists from George Mead through to comtemporary thinkers who have insisted that we can understand people only in their relationships with others. Instead, let's start with John Stewart's paper and with his suggestion that we first discover our "root." In Stewart's arguments, we find all the rationale we need for seeing growth not as simply happening between two people occasionally, but as something which cannot happen otherwise. The roots Stewart refers to all point toward viewing human beings not singly, but in dyadic concert. The phenomenological and philosophical anthropological roots he outlines, however, do not simply suggest we live our lives gregariously. They suggest that a perfectly valid way of viewing humanness is that the "human person can be understood neither as a monad in an alien world nor as simply a part of a collective whole (Stewart, p. 15)."

This insight is important to understand before we go further. For Buber, our existence is defined by, and is to be found in, our relationship with others. There is nothing else. It is a primal category of human reality. Conscious life, therefore,

> ...cannot be grasped on the basis of the ontic of personal existence, or of that of two personal existences, but of that which has its being between them and transcends both...On the far side of the subjective, on this side of the objective, on the narrow ridge where I and Thou meet, there is the realm of "between"....
>
> (Buber, quoted in Stewart, p. 15).

Note carefully that the argument here is that the "between" is not an act or something which we as humans do sometimes and sometimes not. It is that "humanness is an interpersonal phenomenon...(Stewart, p. 15)" and not something which is brought to an interpersonal encounter and subsequently enhanced or inhibited by the quality of that contact. It is that contact.

The quality of each and every interpersonal encounter, therefore, defines and describes one's existence and the quality of that existence. In this view, "growth" as a concept seems to have little value if we take it to refer to change which is somehow divorced from the very element which gives it existence--the interpersonal encounter of two persons in what can be seen as a dyadic system in the truest sense of the word "system." "Growth," as a concept, then, seems less like a description of an individual's movement from point A to point B in this view than a description of the qualities of any given dyadic relationship. In this regard, words like "healthy/unhealthy" may make more sense to use than "growth-promoting/growth-inhibiting." Stewart (p. 18) proclaims that "human growth happens in interpersonal relationships." It seems to us that his own arguments would lead him further into arguing that growth cannot occur except in human relationships, for if we follow his reasoning, there is no existence save in those relationships.

This line of reasoning is, we suspect, at the core of Keltner's postulation of a "third entity" which is created in any relationship between two persons and which he calls the "triadic necessity of humanness (p. 24)." (As an aside, it is probably unfortunate that Keltner also refers to this third entity as a "spiritual child." Such terminology smacks a bit too much of the mystical and the rather common use of such terms is undoubtedly one reason we flounder so in trying to discuss growth-promoting communication.) It is also this kind of thinking, however hazy or obscure it has been or remains, that impels us toward wanting to conceive of communication in transactional terms without yet having the calculus to describe, let along understand, this "relationship-existence." Evidence for our affinity to explain communication in this way abounds in most of our texts. It usually takes the form of saying that communication is a process, is dynamic, on-going, all-inclusive and, as Berlo said many years ago, has no beginning and no end. However, when we try to live up to our conceptual ideals, our lack of a practical calculus to adequately describe this transactional process gets in our way and, more often than not, we end up describing the "process" as a linear affair however much we might try to disguise the arrows in our models. Probably the closest we come to adequately describing the process is through the use of systems theory. Obviously, this approach has influenced our thinking.

It appears that we do have at least a philosophical rationale and foundation for conceiving of growth as an interpersonal pheonomenon. And that the foundation grows, at least in part, out of principles we in communication have found compatible, that of phenomenology. But regardless of whether we are justified in viewing growth this way, what does it mean to do so in practical terms? For one thing, it would re-align our thinking on such issues as the "uniqueness" of individuals (see L. Miller, p. 33 and Patton, p. 53). One of the results of our insistence on assuming growth to be intrapersonal is our insistence on looking for answers to questions of "personal adjustment" within individuals. Following the above arguments for viewing growth as an interpersonal affair, we might also argue that perhaps "individual uniqueness". This may only be useful to do for analytic purposes but not for practically increasing his effectiveness with others. Perhaps we have labored too long in trying to define and work with individuals and not enough with individuals-in-concert, within systems.

The conception suggested here allows us quite clearly to explain why one individual may be able to engage in "growth-promoting" behavior with one person and not with another. In the former situation, both individuals (the subsystems) "own" the growth and therefore can promote it in the other. In the latter situation, perhaps only one person is exhibiting growthful behavior and the other is not, thereby stifling it for both. It enables us more clearly to understand why encounter training may not appear to have much "back-home" value for the same reasons. By focusing so much on the individual, we may have been seduced into measuring (or wanting to measure) in him or her what can only be assessed in specific interaction. Therefore, when one "grows" in specific dyadic relationships within, say, an encounter group, why should it follow that in the multitude of his or her

other relationships (each one a spearate dyadic system) he or she should also exhibit "growth"? If we accept the assumption of growth as interpersonal, we would rather look to each of the dyadic systems to assess growth, not in the individual. Carl Rogers, (1961) once wrote,

> The degree to which I can create relationships which facilitate the growth of others as separate persons is a measure of the growth I have achieved myself.

If it is possible that growth can only occur within the dyadic system, we would re-phrase Rogers and say that the "degree to which I can create relationships which facilitate the growth of others is a measure of the growth we (the interactants) have achieved."

By assuming that growth is a function of a system operating in some way as to be defined as healthy, we can also more easily understand what Donaghy feels will be shown empirically one day--that growth in intact groups is "at least as, and probably more, lasting than that which would have been gained. ..in a laboratory group (p. 70)." In such a situation, the "correct" persons have been trained, i.e., the dyadic systems which will continue on after the training is over. Conjoint family therapists have recognized this for years.

WHAT ALLOWS (OR CAUSES) GROWTH TO OCCUR?

The answers to this question are the great challenges to those interested in growth-promoting communication behavior. We have had, in these papers, very little information presented which would lead us toward clearcut answers to this question. The literature is filled with suggestive terms such as "openness, spontaneity, congruity, empathy," etc. Exactly which behaviors and in which combinations will provoke growth and healthy relationships will remain the focus of research for a long time to come. Again, however, if we accept the premise that growth can occur only in the many dyadic systems each of us has in our lives, we will look for the answers rather differently than if we assume growth occurs within the individual. What we have been confronted with here is a choice of locus for viewing growth. We may end up asking the same questions but looking for the answers in a different place--in the system created by one's relationship with another.

It's not as though we are directionless in thse efforts. By assuming growth to be a shared activity and not a lonely effort, we are thrust in the direction of defining what constitutes a "healthy" relationship and then ferrating out those communicative behaviors which can facilitate the development of a "healthy system." In fact, a great deal of the literature on psychiatric therapy indicates that the primary aim of therapy is a training or re-training of persons in establishing satisfactory relations with others through "healthy" communication techniques. If we allow ourselves the broadest view possible of the role of communication in human relationships,

it would be that while communication at one level may be viewed as a tool or a technique, at another, more general level, it actually is the relationship. At this highly general level, we move much closer to our ideals of communication-as-process.

> Communication processes include all of the psychobiological and culturological processes of transaction that are implicitly in biosocial existence. Thus all transactions within and among living organisms are communication, and all communication is transactional rather than interactional or self-actional.
>
> Buehler and Richmond (1965).

We also have more than enough leads about specific behaviors which may or may not promote healthy relationships between persons. For example, Larson's research on "acceptance/rejection" promises to be fruitful ground for describing at least one variable in establishing healthy relationships (Larson, p.157). What we might learn from psychiatric clinical experience is obvious if we can translate those efforts from a curative to a preventive focus. (For the time being, anyway, it would seem wise to focus in the clinical situation on those relationship disorders which are behaviorally-based rather than on somatically-induced disorders, even though the relationship between them is notoriously hazy).

Finally, our own communication literature is filled with terms whose implications we've barely begun to understand and yet which nearly all who profess to deal in growth-promoting communication training use daily and proffer to others as "healthy" modes of relating to another: empathy, openness, honesty, trust, self-disclosure, and the like. Until we assess the effects of such concepts as they are translated into behavioral dictates, we will remain in the realm of the mystical and the land of the dark.

CONCLUSION

What is being suggested here is not that our goals or intentions or even our methods miss the mark in assessing growth-promoting communication. Rather, it has been suggested that we may be looking in the wrong place to determine what is growthful and what is not. Also, we are suggesting that we are not nearly precise enough in indicating what growth is.

By switching our assumptions from that of growth being defined as an intrapersonal phenomenon to viewing growth as an interpersonal phenomenon, we can broaden our scope to include all concerns appropriate to assessing the individual as well as including a more appropriate set of concerns dealing with the dyadic systems in which we all carry out our lives and which, in fact, define our lives. By this relatively slight shift of focus it becomes easier to understand why we have been confused about the possible benefits of group training or of individual training: we may very well be looking for results in the wrong place. We have tried to define growth in

the most subjective, individual ways possible and thus may have unwittingly primed ourselves for failure.

One suggested direction, then, to come from this conference is to give some thought to the possibility of re-operationalizing "growth" as an interpersonal phenomenon. By doing so, we may be able to isolate and correct some of the more obvious faults of both our theories and our research in the area of growth-promoting communication.

REFERENCES

Buehler, R. E. and J. O. Richomond, "Interpersonal Communication Therapy," Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy, July, 1965, 11 (4) 204-216.

Laing, R. D., Self and Others. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.

Rogers, C., On Becoming A Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Ruesch, J., Therapuetic Communicazation. New York: W. W. Norton, 1961.

Shepard, M. The Do It Yourself Psychotherapy Book. New York: P.H. Wyden, 1973.